# GERMANISCHE BIBLIOTHEK

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

WILHELM STREITBERG †

I. SAMMLUNG

GERMANISCHER ELEMENTAR- UND HANDBÜCHER

---

I. REIHE: GRAMMATIKEN

NEUNTER BAND

# A MODERN ENGLISH GRAMMAR

BY

OTTO JESPERSEN

---

PART III

SYNTAX. SECOND VOLUME

---

HEIDELBERG 1927

CARL WINTERS UNIVERSITÄTSBUCHHANDLUNG

# A MODERN ENGLISH GRAMMAR

ON HISTORICAL PRINCIPLES

BY

OTTO JESPERSEN, PH. D., LIT. D., LL. D.

---

PART III

SYNTAX. SECOND VOLUME

HEIDELBERG 1927
CARL WINTERS UNIVERSITÄTSBUCHHANDLUNG

Verlags-Nr. 2017

# Preface.

When the second volume of this work appeared, in the spring of 1914, I had already written some chapters (on Object, etc.), which I had to leave out in order not to make that volume too big. In 1914 and the following years I went on with my book, but as the war dragged on, and I realized the difficulties of having a book on such a scale (in English and on English) published in Germany during the war or immediately after, I gave my chief energy to other subjects, though still continuing to collect quotations for this grammar. The result has been three volumes on linguistics in general ("Language" 1922, now also in a German and a Japanese edition, "The Philosophy of Grammar" 1924, in this volume denoted by the abbreviation PG, and "Mankind, Nation and Individual" 1925[1]). When I came back to English grammar, I found that most of what I had written previously needed a thorough revision, as my views on a great many points had matured considerably in the intervening years, and it is my hope that the book has gained by this long delay. As a considerable amount of manuscript (on nexus-object, nexus-subjunct, nexus-words, sex and gender, time and tense, etc.) is in an advanced state of preparation, I think I can promise that the fourth volume will not be unduly delayed.

What merit this book may possess is due partly to the number of quotations, partly to new views on some grammatical questions. The way in which quotations are arranged, and the abbreviations used in indicating their sources (a full list of which will be given when the whole work is finished) have allowed me to give more quotations per page than are

[1] "Negation in English and Other Languages" (Royal Danish Academy, 1917, here abbreviated Neg.) forms a connecting link between the English Grammar and these studies in general linguistics.

given in most recent works of a similar character. And then I have throughout tried to look at matters grammatical independently of traditional views. This has entailed some new terms which I hope will be found acceptable to scholars; their number is not very considerable, after all, and it is my impression that they contribute towards a rational understanding of linguistic phenomena. I should also like to point out the improved way of numbering divisions and subdivisions which facilitates references and assists in showing the natural connexions of each phenomenon.

I have perhaps given too few references to books and articles by other scholars: a full bibliography concerning each phenomenon would take up too much space, and specialists will without my assistance find their way to the works of Sweet, Franz, Poutsma, Kruisinga, and other eminent scholars, to whom I owe of course a great debt, as well as to that wonderful store-house of information, the Oxford New English Dictionary (NED). It has been here and there my good fortune to find earlier or better quotations, and even what I think correcter explanations of some phenomena, than are found in that great work; but even then I have been painfully conscious of the inadequacy of my equipment and of the numerous points which I must leave to my successors to clear up.

I may remind British and American readers that it is not my business to tell them what is correct or pure English, but only to register and, if possible, to explain the actual facts of English usage in various periods. But it is my impression that it would be a good thing if what might be called a Grammar of Relativity could be everywhere substituted for the Grammar of Rigidity taught in most schools all over the world.

In this place I want to thank those who have assisted me in various ways. A great many years ago, two of my pupils, Miss Andrea Gad and Aage Brusendorff (now my successor in the University of Copenhagen) copied numerous quotations from my slips into the manuscript in the shape

it had then. A third pupil, Dr. C. A. Bodelsen, read through the MS immediately before it was sent to the printers, and gave me the benefit of his criticism on some points. Several English friends have kindly answered numerous questions on points of current usage; among them I must specially mention Professors Allen Mawer and W. E. Collinson. The latter also read through the whole book in proofs and sent me some most valuable remarks on a great many details. Finally, Mr. R. Hutton, of the University Library of Liverpool, has carefully read two proofs and thus has contributed very much to the correctness of the shape in which the book is offered to an indulgent public.

Gentofte, Copenhagen, in August 1927.

O. J.

# Contents.


Page

**Chapter I. Various Primaries** . . . . . 1

1.1 Adverbs. — 1.2 Preposition plus object.—1.3 Infinitives. —1.4 Genitives.—1.5 An old friend of Tom's.

**Chapter II. Clauses as Primaries** . . . . . 23

2.1—2.2 Content-clauses.—2.3 Clauses with and without *that*.— 2.4 Interrogative clauses.—2.5 Interrogative clauses after prepositions.—2.6 Clauses of wonder.—2.7 No preposition before a clause.

**Chapter III. Relative Clauses as Primaries** . . . . . 52

3.1—3.7 Relative clauses. —3.8 Relative or interrogative.

**Chapter IV. Relative Clause Adjuncts** . . . . . 77

4.1—4.2 Clause and antecedent.—4.3 Preliminary survey.— 4.4—4.9 Restrictive and non-restrictive.

**Chapter V. Relative Clauses Continued** . . . . . 97

5.1—5.3 Words admitting both kinds of clauses.—5.4 Continuative clauses.—5.5 Exhausted clauses.—5.6 Relative connective plus personal pronouns.—5.7 Mental parentheses.

**Chapter VI. Differentiation of the wh-pronouns** . . . . . 116

6.1—6.2 Survey.—6.3—6.6 *who* and *which*.—6.7 *what*.—6.8 Interrogative pronouns.

**Chapter VII. Contact-clauses** . . . . . 132

7.1 History.—7.2—7.3 Object.—7.4 Nominative?—7.5 Subject.—7.6—7.7 Subjunct.—7.8 Final remarks.

**Chapter VIII. Relative that** . . . . . 153

8.1—8.6 Use.—8.7 Analysis.

**Chapter IX. Relative as, than, but** . . . . . 168

9.1—9.5 As.—9.6 Than.—9.7 But.

**Chapter X. Relative Clauses Concluded** . . . . . 182

10.1—10.5 Word-order.—10.6 Whereof, etc.—10.7—10.8 Concatenation.

**Chapter XI. Nexus. Subject** . . . . . 203

11.1 Definitions, etc.—11.2—11.5 Subject, shiftings.—11.6 The path is easy to find.—11.7 Object-subject.—11.8 Sentences without any subject.—11.9 Analysis.

**Chapter XII. Object** . . . . . 229

12.1 Definition.—12.2 Object of result.—12.3 Cognate object. —12.4 Ordinary objects.—12.5—12.6 Verbs with various objects.—12.7 Object after substitutive verbs.—12.8 Object after auxiliary verb.

Page

**Chapter XIII. Verbs with Object or Preposition** . . . . . 252
13.1 About, against, at.—13.2 For.—13.3 From, in, into.—13.4 Of.—13.5 On, upon, over.—13.6 To.—13.7 With.—13.8 Double construction.—13.9 Adverb or preposition?

**Chapter XIV. Two Objects** . . . . . 278
14.1—14.6 Direct and indirect object.—14.7 Place of the indirect object.—14.8 The to-phrase.—14.9 Two direct objects.

**Chapter XV. Subject of a Passive Verb** . . . . . 299
15.1 One object.—15.2—15.4 Direct and indirect object.—15.5 Two direct objects.—15.6—15.7 He was sent for and taken care of.—15.8 Converted subjects.

**Chapter XVI. Transitivity** . . . . . 319
16.1 Object omitted.—16.2 Reflexive pronoun omitted.—16.3 Reciprocal pronoun omitted.—16.4 Move and change.—16.5 Verbs from adjectives.—16.6 Verbs from substantives.—16.7 Causatives and inchoatives.—16.8 Activo-passive use.—16.9 Supplementary remarks.

**Chapter XVII. Predicatives** . . . . . 355
17.1 Predicatives of being. Extraposition.—17.2—17.3 Quasi-predicatives.—17.4—17.7 Predicatives.—17.8—17.9 Predicatives without a verb.

**Chapter XVIII. Predicatives Concluded** . . . . . 383
18.1—18.2 Predicatives of becoming.—18.3 Passive.—18.4—18.5 What can be a predicative.—18.6 Adverbs and prepositional groups.—18.7—18.8 Subjunct-predicatives.—18.9 Final words.

Index . . . . . 405

## Erratum.

Page 25 l. 8 is convenient *read* is not convenient.

## Chapter I.

## Various Primaries.

**1.11.** A primary in most cases is a substantive or a pronoun; but in many cases we find another kind of word or a word-group as a primary (i. e. as subject or as object of a verb or preposition). In such cases it is possible to explain the construction semantically by saying that the adverb, or whatever it is, has the same meaning as a substantive: thus we may say that in "leave here" and "from here" the word *here* has the same meaning as 'this place', and that in "before now" *now* stands for 'the present time', etc., but it would be wrong on that account to call *here* and *now* substantives, as the words have none of the formal characteristics of substantives (II 8.12). Similarly we may say that in the combination "I deny that he is innocent" the whole clause, which is the object of *I deny*, is the semantic equivalent of the substantive 'his innocence', but it could not on that account be termed *grammatically* a substantive. (Cf II 8.51, and note especially the last line there.)

The adverbs *here* and *there* are often the object of verbs of motion: Hope F 57 Shall you be sorry to leave here? (also Di Do 153, Pinero Q 129, &c.) | Quiller-Couch M 82 fortunate to reach here without accident | Hope Z 23 my train reached there in the evening (also Pinero M 91).

**1.12.** Such adverbs of place are also frequently the object of prepositions. The most frequent combinations are *from here*, *from there*, *from where* (*where . . . from*), which have taken the place of the obsolete one-word adverbs *hence*, *thence*, *whence* in the purely local signification; the pleonastic

combinations *from hence*, *from thence*, *from whence* also occur. *From elsewhere.* A rarer combination is *out of there* (e. g. Galsw P 12.73). Instead of saying *to here*, *to there*, *to where* it is usual to leave out the expression of motion and to say *here*, *there*, *where* as in "he came here" | "Where did he go?" Instead of the latter it is possible to say "Where did he go to?" The synonymous words *hither*, *thither*, *whither* are obsolete. Note here the combinations of these adverbs and postposed prepositions: *herein*, *thereon*, *wherewith*, etc.

How old are the combinations *from here*, etc.? They are not mentioned at all in the NED, which has quotations for *from hence*, *from thence* from the 14th and following centuries.

In the combinations *in here*, *in there* it is probably correct to take the two words as parallel adverbs, instead of considering the last as the object of the preposition *in*, as *in* combines the two meanings, which are distinguished in the prepositions *in* and *into*, but not in the adverb *in*: *he sat in there* 'in that place' | *he moved in there* 'into that place', cp "is he in?" | "he came in;" note also the full stress on *in*, and the fact that *in there* is the opposite of *out there*, where *out* evidently is not a preposition, but an adverb.

**1.1₃.** Other adverbs of place as objects of prepositions are seen in: Macaulay H 1.61 all danger *from abroad* (*abroad* historically belongs to 1.2₃) | this merchant deals *with abroad* | Gibson, Diplom. Diary 240 go and see the big guns *from nearer to* | Stevenson JHF 22 the low growl of London *from all round* | id Dy 85 *from hard by* | London A 41 *From all about* could be heard the dull thudding. — Cp also the frequent combinations *by far* (Defoe R 349 the biggest by far that I ever saw), *in so far*, *in as far as.*

**1.1₄.** Adverbs of time are very often the object of a preposition: *from now* | *till now* (e. g. Sh Err I 1.124) | *by then* (a 15th c. instance is Malory 691) | putting off prayers *till afterwards* | *until quite recently* | Wilde D 55 shall you see Basil *between* this and *then*?, &c. So also the relative *when* in BJo A I 364 against one a clock . . . *Till when* you must be fasting (= till then). Cp below 1.2₁ on *before today*, &c.

**1.1₅.** Finally I give a few quotations for rarer combinations of prepositions with adverbs: Kipl P 70 once *in just so often* the brook rose a fraction of an inch | Galsw IC 93 that perfume — *from away back* in the past | Di F 31 home seems such a shelter *after out of doors* | Defoe M 108 how many times shall such a thing fall into hands that will make no scruple . . . *to once* that it shall come into good hands? (cf II 8.5₁).

**1.1₆.** The use of an adverb as a primary may also in some cases appear from its having an adjunct. Thus in *this once*, where the use of *this* is occasioned by *once* having the meaning of 'one time'; further *every now and then*, *every now and again*, *every once and again* (e. g. Walpole GM 391), *every here and there:* NED here speaks of corruption from *ever*. American equivalents are seen in: Lewis B 349 I got to come up here *every so often* | NP 23 and *every once in so often* comes a cartoon of this sort.

Cp also *nowhere*, *somewhere*, *anywhere*, *everywhere*, which might be said to consist of an adjunct and the primary *where*.

**1.1₇.** The adverb *long* must be considered a primary (meaning 'a long time') in combinations like the following: the wound took long to heal | How long does the doctor give him? | Dickinson C 45 though I have spent so long in Europe | Merriman V 287 She had not long in which to think and make up her mind (note here the relative clause). Cp also *for long*, *for ever so long*, and the expanded form in Walpole OL 250 I haven't had a letter from you there for the last ever so long.

*Ever since* (= the time e. s.) is the object of a verb in Galsw TL 33 It had taken him ever since to get used to the idea.

*Twice* is the object in Thack N 53 You didn't have twice of turtle [= two helpings; it would not be possible to say "you didn't twice have of it", where *twice* would be a subjunct].

**1.1₈.** When we say "he had nowhere to go" we may doubt whether *nowhere* or *nowhere to go* is the object; if the latter, 3.7₃ should be compared: "he had nothing to do" is not exactly parallel. Examples:

Brontë J 21 If I had anywhere else to go | Galsw Ca 250 the poor woman had nowhere else to go | Kaye Smith HA 98 irritated at having nowhere to write her letter | Beresford Pris. H. 245 as soon as ever we can find somewhere to live. After a preposition: Mason R 80 crawling over smooth slabs with nowhere to rest the feet or hands | Campbell Shelley 181 any merely scientific conception of life leaves the Son of Man without anywhere to lay his head. Compare also the following sentence in which *nowhere to go* is the subject: Galsw SS 237 in those days there had been nowhere for boys to go.

**1.19.** In recent books one finds not a few instances like the following, in which an adverb like *somewhere* is qualified with a post-adjunct, because it means the same thing as '(at, or to) some place:' Ru Sel 1.475 there are no royal roads to anywhere worth going to | McKenna M 115 you can take me somewhere amusing | Masefield C 63 we should have gone to Venice, or somewhere not half so nice | Galsw IC 75 a sound which seemed to come from somewhere very deep | Oppenheim Laxw 164 Are we going anywhere particular? | Lewis MA 112 from nowhere apparent (other examples Wells, Walpole, Kaye Smith, Milne, &c.) || Galsw Frat 278 with the sheer physical desire to rest — somewhere that was not her home | Maxwell F 215 where are we to feed? — Well, anywhere you like that's quiet | Dreiser F 294 a telephone message or just one word, a few minutes anywhere that he would suggest. This is found as early as Defoe Rox 293 to hinder him going with me anywhere that I had a mind to go.

NED has no examples of this use, but a few of the purely substantival use as in *a somewhere, a nowhere.*

### Preposition plus object as primary.

**1.21.** The first prepositional groups we meet here are those consisting of *to* and a substantive of time. They may be subjects or objects as in: I hope *to-morrow* will be fine | Childers R 293 is *to-day* to be wasted? | Where shall you spend *to-morrow*? They are often the object of a preposition: *before to-day* | not *till to-night* | *after to-morrow* | Sh Ant IV 2.42 I hope well *of to-morrow* (cf Mal 129 redy *by to morne*), thus already Ch B 1070 *until tomorwe*, &c., though it is quite

natural that the preposition *to*, itself, is comparatively rare before them, see however Childers R 293 as *to to-night*, [it is] hopeless, besides the examples quoted II 8.71, where these combinations are called substantives, which they are more certainly in the genitives there mentioned than in the employments dealt with here.

**1.2₂.** The combination of *till* with its object is treated as a primary and thus may itself be the object or subject (meaning 'the time till . . .'): Fielding 4.372 I desired *till the next day* to consider it | Stevenson T 31 You have *till ten to-night* | Housman J 168 Will you allow me *till then*? (Similar examples McKenna SS 109, Bennett RS 209, ECh 302, Tracy P 229, Mackenzie SA 218, Birmingham W 86). — Similarly: Mason R 235 Perhaps I am given *to the summer* | Williamson P 159 it would have taken us *well into the New Year* to accomplish half || Sh Ro II 5.10 and *from nine till twelue* Is three long houres | Galsw SP 110 he had spent *from eleven to one* at his church | Cowper L 1.139 *From infancy to manhood* is rather a tedious period | Galsw 6.79 *Between two o'clock and getting up's* the worst time. [Kipl CV 201 *two into four* goes twice.]

**1.2₃.** We next come to cases in which a combination of a preposition and its object is in itself the object of another preposition: *from behind the tree* means 'from a place situated behind the tree'. Such combinations are very frequent in English: examples will here be arranged alphabetically, some particular phenomena being, however, singled out for separate treatment.

*At:* Ch E 1921 at *after* mete, and id. F 302 at after soper should, perhaps, be written *aftermete* and *aftersoper* | Bennett P 60 you were asleep at after eight o'clock | Swift J 103 sleep at *past* eleven.

*For:* Swift 3.314 for *above* two years.

*From:* Ward F 92 a question which Lord F. had addressed to him from *across* the table | Mitford OV 255 from *amidst* its venerable yew trees | AV Psalms 136.11 brought out Israel from *among* them | Bac A 25 chuse one man from

*amongst* his sonnes | Norris O 335 take his arm from *around* Hilma's waist | Doyle Sh 1.204 my mind was far from *at* ease (cf ch. XVIII) | Scott A 1.323 I . . come myself from *before* the mast | Sh All II 2.32 From *below* your Duke to *beneath* your constable, it will fit any question | Carlyle S 48 from before Noah's Deluge, from *beyond* the Dogstar | Doyle G 118 a whiff of wind came from *in front of* us | (Wells V 26 information from *nearer* the fountain-head) | Defoe R 2.134 from *on* shore . . . from on board | Macaulay E 4.129 his orders have come down to him direct from on high | Defoe G 28 taken from *over* the stall | id Pl 163 from *over against* it [the Hermitage], quite down to Blackwall | Di D 282 I had read these words from *over* the way | Wells H 211 from *round* the corner | Masefield C 104 hidden from *to* seaward | AV Job 26.5 from *vnder* the waters | Stevenson MB 183 he had done so much from *under* lock and key | id. JHF 211 the cards fell from *up* his sleeve | Byron 400 The mists begin to rise from up the valley | Galsw C 59 to exclude such men from *within* the precincts. — *From of old* (frequent, a favourite phrase with Carlyle). — Shaw D 462 take your sickly face away *from in front of* me.

*In:* Norris P 332 I haven't seen C. in *over* a month | Phillpotts GR 171 It settled the police officer in *under* an hour.

*Of:* Masefield S 9 in the cold and dew of *before* dawn | Ch A 445 A good wyf was ther of *bisyde* Bathe | Maxwell F 97 I wasn't thinking of a fortnight. I was thinking of *forever* | Hawth T 139 the guests of *over* night | Di N 65 the pleasures of the table, or the pleasures of *under* the table. — Spencer Educ. 15 anxious that their sons should be well up in the superstitions of two thousand years *ago*.

*Since:* Rose Macaulay P 94 I had been in love with Jane for years; perhaps since *before* the war.

*Till:* Sh Mids II 1.139 Perchance till *after* Theseus wedding day | Williamson L 37 Till *beyond* Dourdan the road is one long switchback | Ellis M 326 Up till *within* about twenty years (three prep.s).

*To:* Sh All II 2.32 (see sub *from*) | Galsw FM 206 she walks blindly round to *behind* the sofa | Benson Blott. B. 193 he ran back into the hall . . . to *beneath* the electric light | Ruskin P 3.86 so I went to *near* Green Street | GE SM 43 flog him to *within* an inch of his life | Mered E 19 sauntering up to within a yard or two of where she sat | Mason F 283 a camel . . . marches to within an hour of his death.

*With:* Di M 8 no connexion with *over*-the-way.

**1.2₄.** These constructions are thus seen to be very numerous in the modern period; in the earlier periods they do not seem to have been particularly frequent: I give examples from Chaucer under *at* and *from*, and under the latter prep. NED has an OE example *fram begeondan Iordanen* and from Wyclif *from on hig*.

**1.2₅.** In a separate sub-class I place here those cases that contain *about*, because it might be said that they are not quite homogeneous with the rest, as *about* may be called an adverb and not a preposition: Di Do 65 at about noon | Wells Br 173 they will have settled everything by about Christmas | Holmes A 169 the amount increases up to about forty-five | Goldsm V 1.173 it was within about four days of her intended nuptials.

**1.2₆.** A second sub-class comprises objects consisting of two parts after *between . . . and*, and *from . . . to*: Defoe R 2.222 pursued by between three and four hundred men | Bennett C 2.200 a man of between fifty and sixty | Di F 2 brown arms bare to between the elbow and the shoulder | id. Do 331 he was tearing through the country at from twenty-five to fifty miles an hour | id. D 130 she'll be home in from twenty minutes to half-an-hour's time | id. Sk 487 young ladies of from sixteen to twenty-six years of age.

**1.2₇.** In a third sub-class the second preposition is qualified by a subjunct: Carlyle R 2.313 Southey was a man towards well up in the fifties | Hope In 197 she at last drove herself to bed at hard on five o'clock | Benson N 17 by soon after ten o'clock a considerable crowd had begun to assemble | Stevenson JHF 9 a cheque for close upon a hundred pounds |

Wells Bish 156 I've been talking for just upon two hours | Galsw C 45 From close beside them George passed by | Bennett Cd 190 that young widow from lower down the street | Gissing B 22 a strange chuckle from deep down in his throat | Mackenzie PR 301 from all over England | Wells V 44 they don't marry . . . until high up in the twenties. Cp also "from a few minutes before five", &c.

**1.2₈.** The combination *from out of* (as in AV Job 24.12 men groane from out of the city | Browning 1.417 from out of the valley | Quiller-Couch M 272 a tinkling sound rose from out of the abyss) in a certain sense is parallel to the last-mentioned ones, but it is impossible to analyze it as 'from a place out (outside) of', and it must rather be looked upon as a simple pleonastic combination of two synonyms. By the side of *from out of* we find in frequent use *from out* (e. g. Sh R2 IV 1.206 and Poe 28 from out my heart | By DJ 1.140 As if she had just now from out them [the bedclothes] crept; ib. 1.148 | Galsw P 10.57 Then from out the church porch come the congregation), where seemingly the two elements are transposed from the usual order, adverb + prep., cp *out of*. In the same way we have the obsolete *from forth* (Mi S 922 fetch thee From forth this loathsome prison-house) and finally *from off* (e. g. Sh R2 IV 1.204 I giue this heauie weight from off my head | Norris O 219 the beer was had from off the ice).

An American friend once told me that *from out* was used preferably before substantives (from out the carriages), and *from out of* before pronouns (from out of them), but I do not find this distinction carried through in the examples I have collected, which comprise quotations from Greene, Peele, Marlowe, Sh, Mi, By, Shelley, Keats, Wordsw, Mitford, Browning, Mrs Browning, Tennyson, Morris, Poe, Stevenson, Mrs Ward, Wells, Galsw, Wilde, London, and Norris for *from out*, and from Bunyan, Whittier, Kinglake, Thackeray, Kipl, Wells, Benson, Galsw, James, Walpole, and Norris for *from out of*.—Cp also Bunyan G 122 out from thence.

**1.2₉.** Parallel to "*from behind* the tree" we should have expected it to be possible to say, e. g. "he ran *to in* the room" (i. e. to a point in the room) and "the cat jumped *to on* the

table" (i. e. to a point on the table), but as a matter of fact the inverse order of the two elements is found in the compound prepositions *into* and *onto*: he ran into the room | the cat jumped onto the table (cp the order in *from out*). While *into* (though often formerly written in two words) has been common from the tenth century, *onto* is much more recent (according to NED it dates from the 16th c.), and the spelling in one word has not even yet been widely adopted; Keats seems to have been the first to write *onto* as one word. A few examples of this preposition may be given, illustrating both spellings:

Keats 4.154 a handsome pile of stones . . . I climbed onto them (also ib. 5.68) | Di X 26 the trunk being tied on to the top of the chaise | Troll B 7 copy it on to one of their own slips | Wilde L 46 as he stepped out of his gondola onto the hotel steps | Gissing B 496 she invited two girls to step out with her on to the lawn | Hankin 2.69 he strolls out on to the terrace and then out into the garden | Bennett W 1.158 sank down onto the sofa.

These two prepositions are distinct from the combinations of the ordinary adverbs *in* and *on* + the prep. *to* (as in: he came in to dinner | they drove on to the Mansion House | he passed the remark on to the Colonel) not only by their signification, but also by having only half stress on the first element and by having a short[n], whereas *in to*, *on to* has strongly stressed *in*, *on* and a long [n]. But the distinction in spelling is not always observed, and we find *into* where *in to* should have been written: Walpole GM 132 they've been into father, and he says . . (i. e. been to his room) | ib. 448 They went into dinner | Bennett LR 226 said Timmerson, coming into Sam one morning.

## Infinitives as primaries.

**1.3₁.** As the infinitive originally is a verbal substantive, it is quite natural that it very often has the usual function of a substantive, i. e. is a primary. *He can sing*

originally meant 'he knows singing', and nothing hinders us from still calling *sing* here the object of *can* (as in the old "Yet can I musick too"); thus also with "He will sing", "He must sing", &c. It is no objection to this view that the "auxiliary" verb, *can*, *will*, etc. is felt to be subordinate in meaning to *sing*, a fact which is shown grammatically by the habitually weak stress of the auxiliary [hi kən ˈsiŋ], *I'll sing*, &c., for who says that the verb is to be semantically and accentually superior to its object? As a matter of fact, we have combinations of a "full verb" and its object in which the verb is accentually weaker than the object, e. g. *take ˈcare*, *make ˈhaste*. If there is nowadays among grammarians a strong feeling against calling *sing* in "he will sing" the object of will, it is chiefly because the whole combination *will sing* is called "future of *to sing*" and is looked upon as a tense of the verb, but this is nothing but an illegitimate transference of grammatical categories of other languages, chiefly Latin, to modern English, and it is better to take the two words, *will* and *sing*, each on its own merits as what it is, a separate verb form, and then study their mutual relation in the same way as that of any other two words. Thus we see that an infinitive (a bare infinitive) is a primary when it is the object of a limited number of (auxiliary) verbs, *can*, *will*, *shall*, *may*, *must*, *need*, *dare*, *do*, and finally — the most important of them all — when it is the object of the preposition *to*. (The other employments of the bare infinitive will be dealt with elsewhere.)

**1.3₂.** In this last combination, the *to*-infinitive, *to* had at first its ordinary prepositional meaning of direction, as still in "he goes to fetch it"; here the group is a subjunct like most prepositional groups. The notion of motion and purpose is still seen in many combinations, e. g. "he was led to believe", "this is nice to eat". But gradually an enormous extension of the application of this *to*-infinitive has taken place: the meaning of the preposition has been weakened and in some cases totally extinguished, so that now the *to*-infinitive must be considered the normal English infinitive,

the naked infinitive being reserved for comparatively few employments, which are the solitary survivals of the old use of the infinitive. This development is not confined to English: we find it more or less in all the Gothonic languages, though with this preposition only in the West Gothonic branch (G. *zu*, Dutch *te*), while Gothic has *du*, and Scandinavian *at* (see Delbrück IF 21.355ff.). A somewhat parallel development has taken place in Fr., cp "ces fruits sont bons *à manger*" | "apprendre *à danser*" (while in other cases a different prepositon is used: "il est facile *de voir* cela"). We may mention also the Magyar development of the inf. in *ni*, which originally had the meaning of motion or aim: *vadászni megyek* 'I go to hunt'. *Kenyeret akarok enni* meant at first 'Bread I want (in order) to eat', then it was shifted exactly as in E. 'I want to eat bread', and finally one said *enni akarok* 'I want to eat' and also as a subject *enni kell* 'to eat is necessary', see S. Simonyi, *Die ungar. sprache*, 1907, 247. (Magyar thus here goes further than G., which has the bare inf. as subject: *essen ist nötig.*). — On the E. development see especially NED s. v. *to* B, H. Willert, ES. 43. 100ff.

**1.3₃.** If now the *to*-infinitive has come in many cases to be used as a primary, this can be compared with the similar use of other *to*-groups (*to-morrow*, see 1.2₁). The *to*-inf. is a primary in the following positions:

(1) as the subject or predicative of a finite verb: *to see* her is *to love* her;

(2) as the object of a verb: he promised us *to come*;

(3) as the subject-part of a nexus-object (acc. w. inf.): he saw fit *to absent* himself;

(4) as the object of a preposition: he was about *to retire*. *About* is now the only preposition which can take a *to*-infinitive, apart from the obsolete *for to go*, which may still be found in archaic style, and it should be noted that *about* may only be used in this way in this signification ('on the point of, going to'): otherwise it requires the *ing*-form like other prepositions: he spoke *about retiring*. Note the two combinations *afraid to go* and *afraid of going*.

On the *to*-inf. as adjunct, see II 14.4 and 15.8.

**1.34.** Note the following two sentences, in which *to*-infinitives are preposed, though with the ordinary word-order we should have had to use *ings*; in both the inf. is the subject-part of a nexus-object: Walton A 177 to do so, they account a profanation | Walker O 5 To discover him [the great man] and then do him and his work justice, Carlyle regards as the first duty of every writer of criticism.

**1.35.** In many cases the *to*-infinitive as a primary is placed in extraposition while *it* represents it in the ordinary position: it is impossible not to love her | he thought it best to absent himself.

Some grammarians disapprove of the term 'object' as applied to the *to*-infinitive (above nr. 2), though the parallelism seems obvious between such sentences and "he promised us a reward". It is no valid objection to say that the inf. cannot be made the subject of the corresponding passive sentence, for there are other cases in which we speak legitimately of an object though a passive construction is impossible, see 15. 12 f.

## Genitives as Primaries.

**1.41.** In most cases genitives are used as adjuncts, as in *Tom's father*. But they also often stand as primaries.

This is quite natural in English as in other languages, when a substantive can be easily supplied from the preceding context, e. g. AV Matt. 22.21 Render therefore unto Cesar, the things which are *Cesars*: and unto God the things that are *Gods* | Di MF 44 the signature, which was a bold one for *a woman's* | Bennett A 140 in hundreds of prosaic breasts, *Tellwright's* included | Locke FS 206 His own fortune had gone. *His dead wife's* remained | Mackenzie C 85 Her teeth were small, white and glossy as *a cat's* | McKenna SS 107 they looked into each other's eyes: then *Sylvia's* fell | Stevenson T 59 threads that seemed no thicker than *a spider's*.

**1.42.** Note in the following quotations the use of the genitive as the antecedent of the relative *which*: Sh As IV 1.10 I haue neither the schollers melancholy, which is emulation: nor the *musitians*, *which* is fantasticall; nor the *cour-*

*tiers*, *which* is proud: nor the *souldiers*, *which* is ambitious: nor the *lawiers*, *which* is politick: nor the *ladies*, *which* is nice: nor the *louers*, *which* is all these | Mered 233 in saying your happiness we have our *Willoughby's* in view *which* is dependent on yours.

**1.43.** Sometimes the substantive does not precede, but follows: Hankin 1.12 I have always heard *Miss Thursby's* was an excellent school. This has been explained in II 10.98, where other examples are given, by the desire to avoid the use of the propword *one* (Miss T's school was an excellent one).

**1.44.** Rarely a genitive primary is non-anaphoric (i.e. does not refer to any particular word found in the context, cp possessive pronouns II 16.232): AV Sol. 6.3 I am *my beloueds*, and my beloued is mine (i. e. the property of my beloved . . . my property).

**1.45.** But very frequently a non-anaphoric genitive is used as a primary, where the meaning is a person's house, shop, &c., or, in the case of a saint, his church (cathedral). This usage probably is developed spontaneously in English, though it is found also in ON., e. g. *at Óláfs* (= at Óláfs bœ or garði, Laxd. saga, 46.8, see the note in Kr. Kålund's ed.), and in Gothic: Luke 19.7 *du frawaurhtis mans* | ib 8.49 *fram þis fauramaþleis swnagogeis.* In English it is naturally most frequent after a preposition, e. g.

Ch A 509 And ran to London unto *seinte Poules* | ShMerch I 3.173 Then meete me forthwith at *the notaries* | Wiv II 2.86 at *Master Pages* | Ado I 1.207 you followed not to *Leonatoes* (very frequent in Sh, though not mentioned in Franz's Shgramm.) | Kemp Nine DW 11 From *this widdowes* I daunst to Bury | Spect. 584 upon my going into *Will's* [coffeehouse] | Lamb E 2.171 to walk into *Colnaghi's*, and buy a wilderness of Lionardos | Di X 45 the inside of *a pawnbroker's* | id T 2.101 money would be drawn out of *Tellson's* [bank] | Wells JP 495 In Berlin indeed in every *photographer's* was the touched-up visage of the Kaiser | Bennett H 18 inquired from *Cook's* the price of a conducted tour | id P 242 going

into a *Methodists'* [chapel] . . . popping like that into the Methodists' . . . I come out of that Methodists' | when they arrived at *Lord's* [cricket-ground] the play had just begun | a fellow of *St. John's* [College].

In dialects *come to mine* is used in the same way, Ellis EEP V 249, 261.

In such cases the construction probably first began through aposiopesis at the end of an utterance. In course of time the genitive came to be used in all positions as a subject or object, &c.:

St. Paul's is one of the principal sights of London | the Queen left St. James's [Palace] yesterday | Sh H4A II 4.576 This oyly rascall is knowne as well as Poules | Di D 248 when he leaves Dr. Strong's [school] | Bennett W 1.66 Holl's, the leading grocer's, was already open | Masefield M 168 They entered Simpson's.

**1.46.** A further step is the possibility of adding an adjunct (article, adjective, relative clause) to such a genitive:

Austen PP 31 at Sir William Lucas's, *where* a large party were assembled | Stevenson T 30 ride to Dr. Livesey's *which* lay in another direction | Bennett T 242 the *chief* poulterer-and-fishmonger's happened now to be the Clayhanger shop | id W 2.319 The shop was closed. And as a *general* draper's it never opened again | ib 1.243 the empty appearance which *a well-managed* confectioner's and baker's always has at night | Doyle Sh 6.101 here's *a large* stationer's | Williamson L 94 we have discovered *a* confectioner's *to conjure with* | Ridge G 169 an aunt of mine had *a* baker's and post office *combined* (cp the article in ib 230 this half-crown, handed in at *the* post-office and grocer's in Hampstead Road).

**1.47.** This may even lead to the formation of a plural: Keats 4.153 Imagine the task of mounting *ten Saint Pauls* without the convenience of staircases | Bennett W 1.13 the square contained five public-houses, a bank, *three grocer's*, *two chemists'*, an ironmonger's, a clothier's, and *five drapers'*.

**1.48.** On account of the difficulty of pronouncing the group [sts] colloquial English prefers "go to the dentist" or

"chemist" instead of the genitive. In books I have found both forms: Di D 579 he went to a dentist's in London | Benson D 13 I'm going to the dentist to-morrow.

## An old friend of Tom's.

**1.5₁.** These constructions are treated here, because the genitive is here as in the preceding sections a primary; but here, in contradistinction to the constructions mentioned hitherto, a possessive may be used in the same way, for we may say, "an old friend of yours | that old friend of yours." Much has been written on these constructions, which are so characteristic of English, see E. Beckmann, ESt 8.412 (who explains them from an imaginary and seemingly impossible combination *a friend mine*); L. Kellner in his ed. of Caxton B. XIX; Einenkel, Anglia 33.504; Trampe Bødtker, Christiania Vidsk. Selsk. 1908 no. 6.34; cf also my own GS § 194, PG 111, S. P. E. Tract XXV. This tract was occasioned by Mr. Fowler's mention (in MEU 399), where he ranks *that nose of his* with certain other constructions as 'plainly illogical' and says: '*a friend of mine*, i. e. among my friends, but surely not *that nose of his*, i. e. among his noses; so the logic-chopper is fain to correct or damn; but even he is likely in unguarded moments to let the forbidden phrases slip out'; so even Mr. Fowler reckons it among recognized idioms, *sturdy indefensibles*, as he terms them. The belief that there is something illogical in this idiom evidently rests on the assumption that *of* here has to be taken in its partitive sense, one of or among several. But *of* has several other meanings —in the *N.E.D.* they are entered under no less than sixty-three numbers—and it may be worth while to examine if another explanation than the partitive might not be admissible.

**1.5₂.** Kellner recognizes three historical stages:

I. *a castell of hers* (from 14th c., Chaucer, &c.).

II. *a knyghte of the dukes* (not yet Chaucer, frequent in Caxton).

III. *that berde of thyne* (rare in Caxton, frequent later).

But he overlooks the fact that stage II is really found just as early as I (see Chaucer G 368 *an officere of the prefectes*), nor is it easy to see why stages I and II should not have sprung into existence at the same time, while there is nothing strange in the later occurrence of III. But Kellner rightly lays stress on the fact that only a few of the constructions admit the partitive explanation; he therefore suggests the name 'pseudo-partitive genitive', but both he and other scholars evidently think that those applications which cannot be explained partitively have developed through analogical extension starting from the partitive use.

The partitive explanation is the only one recognized by Professor Sonnenschein, who says, § 184: 'In sentences like *He is a friend of John's* there is a noun understood: *of John's* means of John's friends, so that the sentence is equivalent to *He is one of John's friends.* Here *of* means *out of the number of.*'

Sonnenschein does not mention constructions like *that long nose of his*; but even if we omit them for the moment, the explanation cannot be strictly maintained, for *an enemy of ours* cannot be the equivalent of *an enemy of our enemies*, which would be taken in a different sense, just as *an enemy of the French* is not to be explained as *an enemy of the French enemies.* And if I say *he is a friend of mine*, I need not at all imply that I have more than the one friend, though of course it will often be understood in this way. To express the partitive sense we have the unambiguous expression *one of my friends.* There is a difference between the two sentences 'The General and some of his friends left the house' and 'The General and some friends of his left the house': while the former implies that he had other friends, the latter means only: 'the General and some people who were on friendly terms with him'.

If Einenkel is right that the English expression *a friend of his* is due to direct imitation of French, where he has found examples like *un chevalier des siens*, the ultimate

beginning of the idiom is partitive, as shown by the French plural. Unfortunately there seems to be no English example old enough to go back to a period when it was possible to distinguish between the singular and the plural of the pronoun: in Old English it would have been, for instance, *an dohtor of minum* with the plural, and therefore, necessarily, a partitive sense, or *an dohtor of minre* with the singular, and therefore not partitive. The modern *a daughter of mine* may be either, as far as the form is concerned.

But it is not at all certain that the construction came to England from France: it may just as well have come into existence independently of the French idiom. The construction with the genitive of a substantive, as in *a friend of my wife's* cannot, at any rate, be due directly to French influence, for the French have no such genitive.

**1.5₃.** Now I think that *of* is not partitive here, or at any rate not predominantly partitive, and I have been led to that conviction by considering certain analogous phenomena in my own native Danish language, which also serve to show how such things can come into existence independently in several languages, for in the Danish construction influence from either Old French or English seems out of the question. In recent colloquial Danish we have constructions like the following: *han tog en ladt gammel bøsse af skyttens* (he took an old loaded gun of the game-keeper's, quoted with a few other similar sentences in *Ordbog over det danske sprog*, *af* 10, where it is placed with partitive *af*). I myself have noted two examples from Danish literature: Hjortø To verdener 131 *Den pæne fletning af Helgas* (that pretty plait of Helga's) | J. P. Jacobsen Saml. værker 2.379 *der er blod paa alle de svøber af deres* (there is blood on all those scourges of theirs). I shall give a few of the examples from the spoken language which I have written down immediately on hearing them: they are not very frequent, and one has to catch them on the wing, as it were: *Er det et lommetørklæde av dit her ligger?* (is that a pocket-handkerchief of yours which lies here?) | *jeg har en sparekassebog av din* (I have a savings-

bank book, belonging to you) | *du kan ta et tæppe av mit* (you can take a rug of mine). The curious thing here is that the singular of the pronoun is used (*dit*, *din*, *mit*), not the plural (*dine*, *mine*); it is not necessarily implied that there is more than one object: *en sparekassebog av din* may be the only bank book he has. The construction with the singular of the possessive pronoun seems to have sprung up quite spontaneously in recent times; I have asked several of my countrymen about it; to some it appears quite natural, while others will not recognize it. It does not seem to be confined to any particular part of the country, but is evidently more frequent in the speech of women than of men. Now (as I learn from Trampe Bødtker's paper, quoted above) the prominent explorer of Norwegian dialects Amund B. Larsen has noticed that in one part of Norway, on the coast of Nedenes, people say regularly *en kniv af min*, *et hus af mit*. This must be quite independent of the Danish as of the English idiom, and I infer from all this that the English possessive too may have been felt from the first as the singular, as it certainly now is in *that old mother of his*, &c.

The insertion of the preposition *of* makes it possible to join a possessive and another adjunct to the same substantive: English cannot have the indefinite article before a possessive, as other languages can, e. g. MHG *ein sîn bruoder*, It. *un mio amico*; it is therefore useful to have the construction *a friend of mine*, and similarly *any friend of mine*, *no friend of mine*, and with other adjectives *an old religious vncle of mine* (Sh As III 3.362)—which cannot be analyzed as one of my old religious uncles. But *this* and *that* could, and to some extent still can, be placed before a possessive (below 1.5$_6$). Here, however, the general disinclination to have another adjunct joined to a possessive has also made itself felt, and has led to the new construction, which is particularly necessary where there is another adjunct besides *that* or *this* (*that long nose of his*).

According to the view here taken, *of* should not be called partitive, but a new name must be found: I propose to call

it *appositional*: its function is to join two words which are notionally parallel, exactly as in *the three of us*: it is impossible to say *the three we*, and therefore *of* is inserted. The combination is distinct from *three of us*, where *of* is unmistakably partitive. Compare also *the City of Rome*, *the name of Trotwood*, &c., where the prepositional group corresponds to what in Latin and other languages is called the genitive of description or definition, but which might perhaps better be called the genitive of apposition, or appositional genitive.

*Of* in all these cases may be said to be simply a grammatical device to make it possible to join words which it is for some reason or other difficult or impossible to join immediately. It is an empty word, to use the expressive term of Chinese grammar; if we want to assign a definite meaning to this *of*, we may say that it means 'who is' or 'which is':

a friend of mine = a friend who is mine (my friend)
no money of mine = no money which is mine
that nose of his = that nose which is his
the three of us = the three who are we
the City of Rome = the City which is Rome.

**1.54.** A similar explanation is applicable to a frequent way of indicating measure after adjectives like *old*, *long*, &c. Here too, Fowler speaks of illogicalities in *a child of ten years old*, while *a child of ten years*, or *a child ten years old* is legitimate, *NED* s. v. *long* speaks of 'mixed construction', and s. v. *old* 4b has a long note with a not very satisfactory explanation based on confusion with the old sb. *eld*. A few examples may be given: Chaucer B 1674 a child of twelf monthe old (also Ros. 402, *NED* has one doubtful example from Chaucer) | Spect 390 a lady of two foot high | Swift 3.32 threads of six inches long | Thackeray N 121 little girls of eight years old.

In this I think that the appositional *of* is used because postposed adjectives are not in general accord with colloquial English: *girls of eight years old* = 'girls who are eight years old'.

A further use of the same *of* is found in the following examples, which have parallels in many languages (PG 98f.):

By 437 a stripling of a page (a stripling who is a page) | Brontë V 98 a Methuselah of a pear-tree | Di H 7 a plain, bare, monotonous vault of a schoolroom | Shaw I 167 a fairly presentable old blackguard of a woman | Swift J 518 she is the devil of a teaser | Di MCh 350 leading a devil of a life | Thack V 180 her old sharper of a father |

ib 260 that clever little wretch of a Rebecca. The appositional character of this *of* is shown in an interesting way in the occasional want of flexion in German after *von*: *ein alter schelm von lohnbedienter* (but with the article: *von einem lohnbedienten*).

**1.5₅.** After thus showing how the construction is to be classed grammatically we proceed to give examples of it, first with the indefinite article:

Ch C 672 He was, pardee, an old felawe of youres | Ch T 1.548 a freend of his | Mal 134 ye shalle be a knyghte of myne | Sh Tw V. a gentleman, and follower of my ladies (i. e. lady's) | R2 III 4.70 To a deere friend of the Duke of Yorkes | Sheridan 224 an old gouty chair of my grandfather's | James RH 253 Hudson's a great admirer of yours | Stevenson JHF 11 I make it a rule of mine.

Examples with numerals, etc.

Mal 35 two stronge castels of his | AV Lu 15.17 How many hired seruants of my fathers haue bread.

Examples with sg or pl without any article:

Mal 48 they were messagers of Arthurs | Sh Mcb V 8.6 my soul is too much charg'd with blood of thine already | Swift 3.368 not to be shaken by arguments of mine | Archer Am 143 people whom he, or friends of his, have met in Europe.

Examples with *any* or *no*:

Ch B 3091 if that any neighebore of myne Wol nat in chirche to my wyf enclyne | Mal 139 no knyghte of yours | any friend of my son's is welcome here | this is no fault of Frank's.

*Own* is often added after a possessive: Sh As IV 1.15 it is a melancholy of mine own | Tw V 288 A most extracting frensie of mine owne | Thack v 19 her daughter's friend has a charming kind heart of her own | we had no money of our own.

Cp *own* after a genitive: Shelley 612 Like a rock of Ocean's own.

**1.5₆.** The combination *this . . . of his* takes the place of *this his . . .*, which was frequent in former times, but is now rare:

Sh As II 1.15 And this our life exempt from publike haunt, Findes tongues in trees | Mi PL 5.114 in this thy dream | Fielding TJ 1.36 this their inclination | 3.241 this his suspicion | Wordsw P 2.466 in this our deep devotion | Ru S 1.182 in this their spoliation | Brontë V 300 even in this his moment of triumph.

Thus also with *that*: Sh Mcb I 7.53 that their fitnesse now Do's vnmake you | Wordw P 11.326 in that my spring of life.

The new construction is seen in these quotations:

Roister 56 this trespasse of thine | ib 73 that tender heart of yours | Marl T 1265 Thou wilt repent these lauish words of thine | id J 2038 This sudden death of his is very strange | Sh Ado IV 1.195 Time hath not yet so dried this bloud of mine | id Gent IV 4.190 If I had such a tyre, this face of mine Were full as louely as is this of hers (cp Lear I 1.267, Tw V 1.54, R2 III 3.133, Hml II 2.46, John III 1.21, VA 500, etc.) | Wordw P 2.449 this uneasy heart of ours | Di D 225 do look at that silly wife of yours | Ru F 93 that life of theirs | Gissing R 96 this beloved home of ours.

This is combined with the construction mentioned above 1.5₄ in Di D 255 that poor dear baby of a mother of yours | Thack V 72 that puling hypocrite of a brother of yours.

Here we may note specially some cases in which the substantive does not immediately precede the *of*-group:

Sh Gent, see above | R3 III 1.32 Fie, what an indirect and peeuish course is this of hers | Hml I 5.51 a wretch, whose naturall gifts were poore to those of mine | Bunyan G 33 my condition was the same with that of his | Swift 3.170 their libraries are not very large; for that of the King's . . . doth not amount to above a thousand volumes | Kingsl H 271 What a noble horse that is of yours! | Hope R 214 it's an ingenious fancy, this of yours, James.

Kruisinga § 935 says that "this husband of yours" is somewhat humorous; similarly Deutschbein ME 188 says that these constructions often have a disdainful tinge, e. g. "that husband of yours". But, as our examples show, this is not true of all cases, and if it can be said of "that

husband of yours", the disdainful tinge is caused by the application of the pronoun *that* to your husband, and not by the combination *of yours*, which nowadays is a simple grammatical consequence of the employment of *that*. Cp "Where is that beautiful ring of yours?"

**1.57.** Examples with the definite article are comparatively frequent in Sh, but rare in PE:

Sh Tw III 4.62 the young gentleman of the Count Orsino's is return'd | Wint V 2.36 the mantle of Queene Hermiones | Cor III 1.95 the horne, and noise o'th' monsters (gen.sg.) | Otway 269 in my face behold The lineaments of hers y'have kiss'd so often | GE M 2.34 The new inward life of hers yet shone out in her face | Bennett PL 311 my style of behaviour at the committee of yours.

The common case after *of* will here be the rule, and PE agrees with the difference seen in the following quotation: Mal 87 he hadde ben *a knyght of kyng Arthurs* & wedded *the sister of kyng Arthur*.

**1.58.** Sometimes we find the common case where according to the preceding sections we should expect the genitive; in some cases this may be due to phonetic reasons, as in Collingwood Ru 366 a cousin of the artist (cf above 1.48) | Di Do 176 It was a trouble to him to think of this face of Florence — or to the disinclination to place the genitive *s* after certain word-groups, as in Ward El 162 I was an old friend of the man in command.

No such reason can be adduced in the following instances, in which the genitive might have been expected: Fielding 3.492 a scheme of our hero, worthy the highest admiration | Morris E 118 And into each mouth of him [Cerberus] cast a cake. — A curious mixture is found in Swift J 173 a Scotch doctor, an acquaintance of the Duke's and me.

**1.59.** We may end our discussion by quoting a remark made by G. C. Lewis (in Earle, Engl. Prose 261): "There is a practical utility in this idiom, as it enables us to distinguish between 'a picture of the king' which is a representation of the king's person; and 'a picture of the king's' which would mean one belonging to the king." Cf Thack

E 1.2 I saw Queen Anne . . . a hot, red-faced woman, not in the least resembling that *statue of her* which turns its stone back upon Saint Paul's. The distinction, however, can only be made in a few cases, and even there is not always observed. We may also say, in speaking of Tennyson, that "an impartial estimate of his" would imply an estimate made by him (corresponding to a subjective gen.), and "an impartial estimate of him" would mean the way somebody else estimated him (objective gen.). After *friend* we may perhaps make a similar distinction and say that *a friend of Tom's* means one whom Tom looks upon as a friend, and *a friend of Tom* one who looks upon Tom as his friend; therefore we say *friends of the people*, *friends of France*; this may account for the common case in Zangwill G 197 he was a great friend of the prisoner | Galsw T 110 I am an old friend of the chairman. But with pronouns always *a friend of hers*, not *of her*.

---

## Chapter II.

## Clauses as Primaries.

**2.0.** A whole clause may under certain conditions be a primary (subject, object either of a verb or of a preposition). This is true both of articulate and of semi-articulate clauses: as an example of the first class we may give (I know) *what we have to do*, and as one of the second class (I know) *what to do*. These clauses fall into the three divisions,

I. Content-clauses,
II. Interrogative clauses (and clauses of wonder),
III. Relative clauses,

which we shall have to treat separately (ch. III).

On temporal clauses used as primaries see 3.7₂ff.

### Content-clauses.

**2.1.** I venture to coin this new term for clauses like the one in "(I believe) *that he is ill*". Such clauses are gene-

rally termed "noun clauses" (or "substantive clauses", Curme), but that name is not very felicitous, because these clauses are not really nouns or substantives, but have only one quality in common with substantives, namely that of being able to stand as primaries — but then, as we shall see presently, that quality is found in many interrogative and relative clauses as well. Besides, as I have said PG 72, it is better to use the word "noun" in the original and wider sense in which it comprises both substantives and adjectives, and then "noun clause" would have no real meaning as applied to these clauses. Neither would it do to call our clauses "that-clauses" (as is often done on the continent: G. *daß-sätze*, Dan. *atsætninger*), for the conjunction *that* is not necessary, and clauses like "I believe *he is ill*", must be treated together with those introduced by *that*.

**2.1₁.** Content-clauses can be employed as primaries in the following cases:

First, as subject, e. g. *That he is dead* seems tolerably certain.

The content-clause is the subject or the predicative in "The worst thing is *that he never answers our letters*".

Content-clauses are not very frequent as preposed subjects (cf on *it* **2.1₃**). Sometimes the words *the fact* or *the circumstance* are used to prop up the clause: Macaulay H 1.31. But the fact that it was thought necessary to disguise these exactions under the names of benevolences and loans sufficiently proves that the authority of the great constitutional rule was recognised | id L 2.284 the circumstance that he was in Parliament was against him [Cobbett].

**2.1₂.** A content-clause is very frequently the object of a verb: I believe *that he is dead*. Thus also in Mered E 233 they protested *that they had very few words to say* [=said in protest that . . .].

Sometimes a content-clause is placed parallel to another object, though this is not nowadays considered very elegant: Bunyan G 123 Do not think yourself so well enlightened,

and that you have received a gift above others | Defoe R 2.5 she found me very intent upon her words, and that I look'd very earnestly at her.

A content-clause may be the subject-part of a nexus-object, as in Mac B 188 That he could vindicate himself from all the charges which had been brought against him, we knew to be impossible.

**2.13.** When for some reason or another it is convenient to put a content-clause in the ordinary place of the subject, object, etc., the clause is placed at the end in extraposition and is represented in the body of the sentence itself by *it*. Thus frequently when the clause is the subject, as in "*It* seems certain *that he is dead*", and necessarily when it is the subject of a question: "Is *it* certain *that he is dead*?" When the content-clause is to be the subject-part of a nexus object, front position as in the quotation from Macaulay is much rarer than end position with a preceding representative *it*: as a matter of fact, Macaulay continues: "But we thought it highly probable that some grave accusations would be refuted."

Two old quotations may be given for this construction: More U 234 they thinke it against al right and iustice, that men shuld be bound | ib 235 they thinke it most mete, that euery man shuld pleade his owne matter.

As the object regularly follows the verb, a representative *it* would generally be superfluous, but there are a few verbs that require this *it* before a clause, thus *owe*, *will have* (in the sense 'apprehend, interpret'), *take* (in a similar sense): Macaulay E 2.295 the men to whom we owe it that we have a House of Commons | Merriman S 8 he owed it to his mother's influence that the responsibilities of princedom were his || Mac E 2.222 he will have it that all virtues and all accomplishments met in his hero | Hope R 174 still she would have it that all men hailed him for their king | Shaw 1.53 if you will have it that you are well | I take it that he gives his consent | Macaulay (q) he *laid it down* that no subject had a right to petition the King.

**2.14.** Some verbs which are freely used with a substantive as an object cannot take a content-clause in the same way: we do not say "this *caused* that he was discovered", but only "his discovery" or "his being discovered" or "him to be discovered" (though in former times it was possible to say "cause that . . ."; the last example in NED is from Defoe 1722); instead of "I *regret* that he could not come" and "I *wanted* that he should come" or "I *like* that he comes" we say "I regret to say that he could not come" or "I regret the fact that he could not come" and "I wanted him to come" or "I like him to come". Parallel to "this *explains* his absence" we cannot say "this explains that he was absent", but only "this explains why he was absent" or "how it was that he was absent" or "the fact that he was absent", though in a different sense *explain* may have a content-clause as its object: "He explained that he had been held up by an accident" i. e. said in explanation (of something else) that . . . It is rare to find, as in Walp OL 203 she did not *mind* that she should be thought a fool; instead of the usual "mind being thought".

**2.15.** As already hinted, the difficulty of joining an object to certain verbs can be evaded by inserting *the fact* (or, *the circumstance*). How old is this usage? NED has no examples. It is especially frequent in modern scientific prose. A few examples from ordinary prose: Wilde P 39 I must *accept* the fact that one is punished for the good as well as for the evil that one does | Shaw Mo 3 Have you ever *considered* the fact that I was an afterthought? | Bennett P 52 we have to *conceal* the fact that we were in the W.A.A.C. | this could not *hide* the fact that he was growing old | NP the writer here *overlooks* the fact that human beings are not perfectly logical in every respect | Tarkington Women 73 I'm afraid you *overlook* the circumstance that you've been requested to leave my house. Cf also below on prepositions. The use of *the fact* also enables us to join an adjunct to a content-clause, as in *the mere fact that* . . .

**2.16.** It is quite natural to call the clause an object in

"The natives believe that the whites are great magicians", and we may perhaps also say that in "The natives have the belief that the whites are great magicians" the clause is the object of the whole phrase "have the belief"; some would even call it the object of the word *belief* in itself, thus also in "their belief that . . ." | "his hope (wish, desire, etc.) that . . ." There are similar instances, where there is no corresponding verb: "I have the idea that he is not quite honest" | "their idea (notion, impression, view, sentiment, doctrine, etc.) that priests are infallible". Some grammarians here disapprove of the term "object" and say that the clause is appositional to the preceding substantive. The question of terminology need not detain us here, where we are only concerned with the indubitable fact that all these clauses at any rate are "primaries". So they are also after the inserted words *the fact* (2.1₅; cf 2.3₅, 3.1₁).

**2.2₁.** A content-clause may be the object of a preposition. In former times prepositions were freely used before the conjunction *that*, as when, for instance *ere that* took the place of OE *ær þæm þe* (where *þæm* is the dative of the demonstrative neuter, and *þe* is the usual conjunction serving to show subordination). Early ME examples are Vices & V 9 *fram ðat* ic cuðe speken | 37 *ðurh ðat* he dieð swa michel | 81 *after ðat ðe* ðin mildce ys michel. In Orrm we find *off þatt*, *forr þatt*, *þurrh þatt*, *fra þatt* and others, in Chaucer *after that*, *before that*, *but that*, *by that*, *er that*, *for that*, *save that*, *sith that* or *sithen that*, *til that*. *That* was a frequent, but by no means indispensable, sign of subordination: it served to show that what followed was no independent sentence, but a dependent clause, and thus made the preposition *after* and the adverb *now*, for instance, into the "conjunctions" *after that* and *now that*, e. g. in "after that it had happened" and "now that he is here". But the word *that* was also often inserted more or less uselessly after words which in themselves were conjunctions, e. g. *if*. The insertion or omission of *that* thus came to be felt as a matter of indifference, see e. g.

I think (that) he can come,
if (that) he can come,
though (that) he can come, etc.

In "after that (before that) this had happened" *after* and *before* were originally prepositions having the clause with *that* as their object, but now *after that* and *before that* became a kind of composite conjunction, in which *that* was viewed in exactly the same way as in the other combinations mentioned, and therefore was frequently omitted. In all these cases the insertion of *that* fell more and more into disuse, and is not found in literary style and in educated speech; thus *after*, *before*, *till*, *since* are in this respect placed on the same footing as *if* and *though*: they are, to all intents and purposes, conjunctions, though in other combinations they are prepositions; to this category we must also reckon *against*.

**2.2₂.** Apart from these conjunction-prepositions there are in MnE few prepositions that can take a clause as their object. First we may mention *except* and its synonyms *save* and *but*, e. g.

Bennett W 2.332 She knew nothing *except* that the people now shopped in Hanbridge | NP '24 Little is known of his life *save* that he outwitted a miserly parent | Galsw Ca 35 he forgot everything *but* that he was near her.

With *except* this construction may be explained from its origin: the clause may be taken as the subject part of a subjunct nexus, whose predicate part is *except* (= excepted): this will account also for the construction in Galsw Ca 22 she held him in a vice, *notwithstanding* that everything about her threatened the very fetishes of his existence.

**2.2₃.** There are also some rare examples of other prepositions which are approximately on the same footing as *except*:

Sh As I. 1.12 his horses are bred better, for *besides* that they are faire with their feeding, they are taught their mannage | Fielding 5.562 *besides* that he doubted not . . . he conceived they should be altogether safe | North

239 he entred, *without* that any one of them durst turne their face vpon him | Brontë V 107 it was next to impossible that a casket could be thrown . . . *without* that she should have caught intimation of things extraordinary | NP '95 *Beyond* that my opponent had some advantage in the matter of attack, our positions seemed to me about equal | Ru P 1.252 if Carlyle had written, *instead of*, *that* he wanted Emerson to think of him in America, that he wanted his father and mother to be thinking of him at Ecclefechan, that would have been well.

**2.24.** Otherwise *in that* and *for that* are the only combinations of this kind that are still in use.

*In that* is frequent (at least from the 15th c.): More U 93 the dewtie of a shephearde is, in that he is a shepherd, to feade his sheepe | ib 282 | Sh As I. 1.50 the courtesie of nations allowes you my better, in that you are the first borne | AV Gen 42.21 we are verily guiltie concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soule | Bunyan G 110 I was the nearest the Papists . . in that we understood the Scriptures literally | Mrs. Browning A 156 And, in that we have nobly striven at least, Deal with us nobly | Troll O 49 he did not think better of her in that she had indulged in such a fancy | Locke GP 142 Myrtilla's criticisms could not be helpful in that they would be based on misapprehension of facts | men differ from brutes in that they can think and speak. This *in that* is literary rather than colloquial.

Schmidt, Sh-Lex. 1197, thinks that *that* in this group is the demonstrative pronoun with omission of the conjunction. Bøgholm B 50 supports the same view by saying that the pronunciation is [ðæt]. But as a matter of fact the usual pronunciation is [inðət], as I have often heard, and English friends tell me that this is the normal pronunciation. On the other hand the conjunction may be pronounced everywhere with a full vowel in emphatic or rhetorical utterance.

**2.25.** *For that* used to be very frequent, generally with the force of *because*. Examples: More U 232 to mocke a man for hys deformitie, or for that he lacketh anye parte [note the parallelism between the sb and the clause] | on nearly

every page of North's Plutarch | Sh Merch I. 3.43 I hate him for he is a Christian: But more, for that in low simplicitie He lends out money gratis | Defoe R 2.148 he could not do that by any means, for that it would put the whole island into confusion (very often in Defoe) | Bunyan G 7 I magnifie the heavenly Majesty, for that by this door he brought me into this world | Di T. 1.99 an indictment denouncing him for that he was an false traitor [imitation of legal phraseology?] | ib 2.195 a race proscribed, for that they had used their privileges to the oppression of an people | Henley Burns 272 I do not know that we need think any the less of Burns for that it [originality] is not predominant with him | Kipl S 91 he lifted up his voice in thanksgiving for that the world had warriors so wise | id K 79 He is ashamed for that he has made a child happy | Mc Kenna While I Rem. 155 These early impressions are perhaps the deeper for that there was so little in those early days to disturb a course of general reflection.

In the recent examples it will be seen that *for* has its usual force, as if followed by a substantive; in this way *for that* (which introduces a dependent clause) is different from present English *for*, which introduces a coordinate independent statement. (In ElE *for* also in itself was a conjunction with a dependent clause, which might even precede the principal statement).

**2.26.** In the following sentences the clause has front position, and the preposition comes behind, joined to the verb: when the writer began his sentence, he probably had not yet made up his mind what construction to use: Defoe Pl 121 but that he was a poor piper, and that he was carried away, as above, I am fully satisfied of the *truth of* [= I firmly believe] | Boswell 2.23 That certain Kings reigned, and certain battles were fought, we can *depend upon* as true | Mered H 471 That his treatment of Old Tom was sound, he presently had *proof of* [= saw proved]. Fielding writes, T 3.188: This the guide *insisted upon* was impossible. Here we have a parenthetic insertion, and cannot say that *upon* has any clause as subject.

**2.2₇.** If the need of having a content-clause dependent on a preposition arises less frequently in English than in Danish, where such constructions are extremely frequent, it is chiefly due to the great extent to which the *ing*-construction is used. In other cases the use of a clause after a preposition is rendered possible by the insertion of such a word as *it*, *this*, *that*, *the fact* or *the circumstance*, to which then the clause is added "in apposition". Examples with *it*: Hardy W 215 *Depend upon it* that cold is hanging about you yet | Doyle M 90 you may *rely on it* that I shall give you a full account | Austen P 144 now, I do *insist upon it*, that you hold your tongues | GE Mm 116 the old fellow will *insist on it* that Fred should bring him a denial | Di D 191 I *insist upon it*, that there shan't be a word about it | Ru S 134 *see to it* that your train is of vassals whom you serve | Shaw P 101 *see to it* that no harm comes to her | Kipl J 2.83 *look to it* that all the jungle knows these two are safe | Phillpotts K 173 he *held to it* that his crime could never be lessened | Austen M 69 I will *answer for it* that we shall find no inconvenience | GE S 142 I'll answer *for it* the next shall be as good | Galsw P 3.15 I don't see how we can *get over it* that to go on means starvation.

Instead of *see to it that the door is locked* we may say simply *see that* (2.7₃).

**2.2₈.** Examples of *this* before the clause: Sh Tw II.5.179 euery reason excites *to this*, that my lady loues me | Defoe M 216 they brought my attorney *to this*, that he promised he would not blow the coals | Troll A 234 No two writers were ever more dissimilar, — except *in this* that they are both feminine | NP '25 Mr. Bridges is English to the core, and not least *in this* that his poetry has never been forced. Bøgholm B 49 has some examples of *this* and *that* from Bacon. A modern example of *that* is Troll W 128 it may come *to that*, that we must leave this place.

**2.2₉.** Examples of *the fact that*, which belongs chiefly to scientific prose: Harraden D 180 everything points

*to the fact that* even if she is dead, it wasn't her death only which turned you to stone | Kittredge Ballads XIV The lack of similar texts . . is no evidence at all, except, perhaps, *of the fact that* such pieces were in the possession of the folk | NP '25 This may be attributed *to the fact that* the development of science has mainly taken place in Christian countries | Russell Ed 105 Great Britain is losing her industrial position *through the fact that* the authorities do not value or promote intelligence.

It is quite natural that the combination with *the fact* is used when the clause deals with something real and with something belonging to the past, while *it* may be used when it contains something that is merely imagined or anticipated in the future.

An example of *the circumstance*: Macaulay H 1.66 This is to be partly ascribed to the circumstance that they were some centuries behind their neighbours.

### Clauses with and without that.

**2.31.** In combinations like "I think he is dead" it is historically wrong to say that the conjunction *that* is omitted. Both "I think he is dead" and "I think that he is dead" are evolved out of original parataxis of two independent sentences: "I think: he is dead" and "I think that: he is dead". In the second the word *that*, which was originally the demonstrative pronoun, was accentually weakened, as shown also in the vowel, which is now usually [ə] and not [æ] as in the demonstrative pronoun, and this weakened *that* came to be felt to belong to the clause instead of, as originally, to what preceded, i. e. it became a "conjunction".

The distinction between the two constructions is therefore now that in one the subordination of the clause is left to be inferred from the context, in the other the subordination is expressly indicated. Therefore *that* is necessary in those cases in which the mutual relation of the two sentences is not perfectly evident from the material contents

of each or from their position; *that* is often desirable to avoid doubt as to their mutual relation or as to the belonging of some word or word group. But when no doubt can arise, the construction without *that* is always more straightforward, more direct, more natural, therefore it is preferred in conversation, in easy literary prose, also in easy poetry. But in scientific prose, in philosophy, and in the corresponding forms of poetry, authors are generally so conscious of the subordination of one sentence to the other that they prefer the express indication by means of *that*. It should be remembered also that in speech the tones of the voice and the absence of any pause show the close connexion, while in writing we have no corresponding means, except perhaps, the non-use of a comma before the clause.

**2.3₂.** The shorter construction (without *that*) is especially frequent after such verbs as *say*, *think*, *believe*, *suppose*, *imagine*, *see*, *remember*, *know*, etc. Here we must notice the difference between direct quotation and indirect quotation, as in "he says: I will go" and "he says he will go". In many cases both are identical, as in "he says this is true", but in others we have a shifting of person, as in "he says he is ill" (= "he says: I am ill") or of tense, as in "he said this was true" (= he said: "this is true") or of both person and tense, as in "he said he was ill" (= he said: "I am ill"). But in spite of these shiftings (which will be dealt with in other places) the relation between the two sentences is so obvious that no *that* is required. Compare also the frequent position of the sentence containing *say*, etc., as a parenthetical insertion: "This, he says, is true", "This, I know, is true", or after the other sentence "This is true, he says", "This is true, I know", "He was ill, he said". If one of these arrangements is used, we speak of two coordinated sentences, but if we use the other arrangement, with *say* or *know* first, we generally feel the contents of the saying or knowing as subordinated, i. e. as a clause. Sometimes, however, the subordination is not very pronounced, for instance in Brontë P 51 God knows I should like to go!

Note also the construction in Sh Oth II 2.9 So much *was his pleasure* should be proclaimed, where *that* would be impossible (because there would be no subject after it), while *that* would be required in "It was his pleasure that so much should be proclaimed".

Since this chapter was written, the subject of the omission of *that* has been briefly treated by two English grammarians. (1) Palmer Gr § 424: In the following types of sentence the general conjunction is never expressed: I wish he'd come! | I hope it doesn't rain to-morrow | It is time we went | I'd rather you went to-morrow.—(2) Fowler MEU 633: *That* is usual with *agree, assert, assume, aver, calculate, conceive, hold, learn, maintain, reckon, state, suggest; that* is unusual with *believe, presume, suppose, think; that* is used or omitted with *be told, confess, consider, declare, grant, hear, know, perceive, propose, say, see, understand.* Both rules are instructive, but neither is comprehensive enough.

**2.331.** Let me give here some quotations for clauses without *that*, including some in which the omission of *that* seems unusual or unnatural:

Dekker F 1240 put that money in your purse, and *giue out* he dyed a begger | Sh Merch I. 1.2 you *say* it wearies you | ib V. 1.18 In such a night Did young Lorenzo *swear* he lou'd her well | id As III. 2.263 Do you not *know* I am a woman? | Hml III. 2.386 (Q 2) do you *think* I am easier to be plaid on then a pipe? | BJo Fol 505 'Tis *pittie*, two such prodigies should liue | Swift 3.288 I at last *concluded* they must needs be magicians | id 3.366 he *doubted* [= feared], it would be impossible for me to swim to another country | Goldsm 635 you don't *consider*, we have got no answer from our fellow-traveller | Ru Sel 1.247 his constantly painting it does not *prove* he delighted in it | GE Life 2.76 I never *think* what I write is good for anything | Kaye Smith T 262 I *consider* Monypenny muffed that business badly.

Di N 381 so God bless him and them, and *send* we may all meet together | Kipl L 158 Heaven send he'll listen to me.

Goldsm 656 so I *beg* you'll keep your distance | Aust S 177 She instantly begged her sister would entreat Lady Middleton to take them home | Collins W 254 she begged we would kindly excuse her | Mackenzie PR 284 I beg you will do nothing of the kind | Goldsm 669 My mistress *desires*

you'll get ready immediately | ib 674 I must *entreat* you'll desist. — In such cases an infinitive-nexus is more usual.

Goldsm 674 I'll *engage* my Kate covers him with confusion | Sh H 4A II 4.162 I would *giue* a thousand pound I could run as fast as thou canst | Goldsm 646 It's *a thousand to one* I shan't like him. . . It's more than an even *wager* he may not have you | Bennett P 60 I *lay* you five to one I don't have jaundice.

**2.3$_{32}$.** After *I had rather* the leaving out of *that* is decidedly the rule: Defoe R 2.114 our men had much rather the weather had been calm | Thack N 92 I'd rather Clive were dead than have him such a heartless worldling | ib 803 I had rather the dear old gentleman was at home | Shaw P 14 Perhaps you had rather I did not intrude on you just now | ib 128 I had rather you stayed | Wells T 48 I'd rather he didn't. — Thus also after *rather than*: Gay BP 102 it obliges me to offer my-self once more, rather than the audience should be dismiss'd | Scott Iv 278 he shed the blood of infancy, rather than a male of the noble house of Torquil should survive | Locke S 145 She would die rather than Zora should know.

**2.3$_{4}$.** In some cases *that* is indispensable to indicate subordination.

(1) When the content-clause is placed first: That time is money has never been realized in the East | That he is guilty I feel some difficulty in believing.

Sentences like "He is innocent, I think" or ". . . I know" are not exceptions to this rule: here we have coordination, not subordination, and the short sentences "I think", "I know" are tagged on as afterthoughts, restricting the already completed sentence.

Sometimes the content-clause is made to stand alone (through aposiopesis) as in "pull-up" expressions of surprise or of desire: Sh Hml I 2.137 That it should come to this! | Merch II 4.41 O that estates, degrees, and offices, Were not deriu'd corruptly, and that cleare honour Were purchast by the merrit of the wearer.

**2.35.** (2) When the content-clause is added to some substantive such as *belief*, *conviction*, *notion*, *idea*, *reason*, *fact*, etc. (cf 2.16), where it is obvious that the indication of subordination is generally necessary to make the sentence at all clear:

MacCarthy 2.379 in the sincere *belief* that they were helping | my *suggestion* that he was mad was not accepted by everybody | they acted on the *ground* that severe trouble was to be feared | we infer this from the *fact* that his parents were poor | in *order* that (to the *end* that) happiness may reign there | on *condition* that he will pay the amount in full.

But very often in colloquial style the phrases "I've a notion", "I've an idea" are used loosely so as to be practically nothing but equivalents of "I think", and then they are analogically used without *that*: "I've a notion he'll succeed".

*In case* (he comes) has generally taken the place of the earlier *in case that* and is felt as one composite conjunction. This is even more the case with *because*, which is now used without *that*, whereas the earlier phrase was *by* (*the*) *cause that*, *because that*. Historically such clauses may be said to be content-clauses, though now of course they are clause-subjuncts (clauses of condition and cause).

**2.361** (3) A special case is the use of representative *it* as described above 2.13. Here, too, the indication of subordination by means of *that* is generally required. Still we find, here and there in colloquial style, examples without *that*:

Hope R 92 I take it he should be equal to the task | Bennett P 236 am I to take it you want to find out all you can? | Wells Fm 61 I take it the reader has seen pictures of the moon | id V 49 she took it for granted Ann Veronica wore stays.

It is rare to find both *it* and *that* omitted: Wells H 199 that school of optimism that would have each dunghill was a well upholstered throne.

There is hardly any subordination in combinations like the following, in which we might write a colon after *depend upon it* and treat what follows as an independent sentence:

as a matter of fact the writers have put neither colon nor comma between the two parts and thus have marked the second as a dependent clause: Goldsm V 1.117 depend upon it he knows what he is about | Aust M 395 depend upon it there is some mistake | Brontë V 155, Di D 98, Thack N 392 | GE Mm 53 you may depend on it he will say "Why not?"

**2.3$_{62}$.** *That* is also as a rule required when the representative *it* introduces the sentence:

It is to be regretted that he should have committed this foolish act | It was a good thing that he came back so soon, etc. Cp also: I looked upon it as very awkward that he changed the subject just then.

Here, however, there is a tendency in colloquial English to dispense with *that*, especially in very short sentences:

It is true he did not mention it | it was good he came (= I am glad he came) | GE M 1.274 it seemed only natural this should happen | Stevenson JHF 25 it is as well we have met | id T 201? It occurred to me there was no time to lose.

**2.3$_{7}$.** *That* is generally found when *it is* (*it was*) serves the purpose of giving front position to some subjunct:

It is under such circumstances that one recognizes one's true friends | It was in the night time that the necessity of such precautions was most clearly perceived.

The omission in the following quotations seems more or less unnatural:

Fielding TJ 1.142 it was to save them from destruction I parted with your dear person | Lamb R 13 it was by a mercy she escaped | Aust S 368 it was but two days before, Lucy called and sat a couple of hours with me [i. e. she called, only two days before] | Brontë J 310 It was not without a certain wild pleasure I ran before the wind | ead V 376 even then, it was not in fear, but in seeming awe, he raised his eyes.

**2.3$_{8}$.** (4) For the sake of clearness it is generally desirable to have *that* before the second of two coordinate clauses, even if there is none in the first:

Caxton B 42 all sayde he was a knyght right goode and fayre, *and that* it seemed wel | Lyly C 284 Melissa told mee it was his manner, *and that* oftentimes shee was fain to thrust meat into his mouth | Sh R3 III 5.41 What? thinke you we are Turkes, or infidels? *Or that* we would, against the forme of law, Proceed thus rashly in the villains death | Defoe R 37 he generously told me, he would take nothing from me, *but that* all I had should be deliver'd safe to me | Swift J 174 I dream very often I am in Ireland, *and that* I have left my clothes behind me | Cowper L 1.136 he would find his ceilings were too low, *and that* his casements admitted too much wind | GE M 2.187 he only wished he dared look at Maggie, *and that* she would look at him | Stevenson T 73 I believe he was really right, *and that* nobody had told the situation of the island | Hope D 9 he said I'd destroyed his faith in women, you know, *and that* I'd led him on, *and that* I was — well, he was very rude indeed | Wells U 67 Thank Heaven this is my book, *and that* the ultimate decision rests with me.

Note further Ru S 128 Three girls repeatedly declared they had never heard of Christ, *and two that* they had never heard of God. — Compare also the frequent use in former times of *that* instead of repeating another conjunction (*if . . . and that*, etc.).

**2.3₉.** Sometimes *that* may be necessary for the sake of clearness to show where a subjunct belongs:

He told us yesterday that he had seen a glorious sight | he told us that yesterday he had seen a glorious sight | I noticed that while she was present he would never say a word | I noticed while she was present that he would never say a word.

In many cases the insertion or omission of *that* may depend on individual or momentary fancy, in which rhythmical considerations may also play some role.

The whole subject should be compared with what is said below, on Relative clauses with and without *that*.

## Interrogative Clauses as Primaries.

**2.411.** Interrogative clauses are dependent clauses corresponding to questions. Questions are of two kinds which I have termed *x-questions* and *nexus-questions*: in the former there is an unknown "quantity" (an x) indicated in the question by an interrogative pronoun or adverb; in the latter the speaker calls in question the truth of some "nexus": is it correct, yes or no, to connect this particular subject with this particular predicate? (See PG 303). Both kinds of question undergo certain grammatical modifications when made into dependent clauses. Persons and tenses are shifted as in other kinds of indirect speech. Instead of the inverted word-order as in "Who is this person"?, "What is he eating?", "Why am I so sad?" we have the ordinary order with the subject before the verb: "I never discovered who this person was", "I want to know what he is eating", "I know not why I am so sad" (Sh Merch I 1.1); consequently the auxiliary *do* is not needed as in many direct questions: "What does he eat?" becomes "I want to know what he eats".

The distinction between indirect speech (hypotaxis) and direct speech (parataxis) is well brought out in Sh As III 2.200 tell me *who it is* . . . tell me, *who is it* quickly—note here the word *quickly*: Rosaline gets impatient, and therefore uses the more colloquial, direct question instead of a clause.

**2.412.** There is no dependent interrogative clause in such combinations as: What will he do, do you think? | How many copies were sold, did you say? Here the first part cannot be said to be the object of the last verb, for it is impossible to invert the order and say "Do you think, what . . .", etc. Neither have we two coordinate (paratactic) questions. A few examples from the printed literature:

Congreve 236 What do they mean, do you know? | Poe 255 How much was the reward, did you say? | Mered EH 31 At what time shall we arrive, may I ask, do you think?

Note that there is another way of knitting two such questions together: "When do you think we shall arrive?" Here the second question is made dependent, as shown by the word-order; but the interrogative word, which logically belongs to the second verb, is placed with the first. Similar concatenations are very frequent in relative clauses, see 10.7 and 10.8.

**2.4₂.** The word-order of the direct question is generally retained in the usual phrase "(We ran out to see) *what was the matter*", but this is due to special reasons (see 18. 5₃) and is therefore not exactly analogous to the occasional use of the word-order, verb before subject, in dependent interrogative clauses. This may sometimes be due to the same causes which produce the identical word-order in statements (as in Sh Merch I 1.18 Plucking the grasse to see where sits the winde—cp Here sits the wind), sometimes to the retention of the form of the direct question (as in Sh Merch III 2.63 Tell me where is fancie bred | Di D 357 I considered what could I do—which might just as well have been written: "Tell me: Where is fancy bred?" and "I considered: What could I do?"). See below on the corresponding phenomenon in nexus-questions (2. 4₈).

In the earlier stages of the language the subordination of an interrogative clause was sometimes indicated by the insertion of *that* as in other clauses: Ch LGW 1449 And chees what folk that thou wilt with thee take | id MP 3.1183 I bethoghte me what wo And sorwe that I suffred tho | Caxton R 67 men shal wel knowe who that I am.

**2.4₃.** An interrogative clause may be a primary either as the subject, as the object of a verb, or as the object of a preposition.

Interrogative clauses are not very frequent as subjects of sentences. I can find no mention of this matter in any of the grammars I have consulted. First we have examples of clauses with introductory pronouns or adverbs (x-questions):

*Who can have done it* is a riddle to me | Dreiser F 226 *What to do* was beyond him | Wells Und. F. V 2 *Which*

*side may first drop exhausted now*, will hardly change the supreme fact | Bennett L 146 *Why they don't make 'em unload somewhere else* beats me | Oppenheim People's Man 56 *Where you are* is nothing to me | Kaye Smith T 259 *Wherein his terror lay* might not be easy to guess | Wells TM 63 But *how it got there* was a different problem | *Why she should come here at all* puzzles (beats, licks) me. Note the plural of the verb, because there are virtually three clauses, in Birrell Ob 11 how men laughed, cried, swore, were all of huge interest to Carlyle.

If the clause is not placed first, it has to be represented by *it*: *It* does not interest me in the least *who will be Prime Minister in fifty years* | Kaye Smith T 288 *it* mattered little *who filled the town* as long as it was full.—*It* would be required nowadays in "What the devil does it signify how you get off?", but Sheridan (303) writes without *does*: What the devil signifies how you get off.

**2.44.** If a dependent nexus-question is to be the subject of a sentence, the conjunction *whether* has to be used, because *if* in that position would easily be taken to be the conjunction of condition:

*Whether this was the true explanation* did not concern him | Swift T 5 *Whether the work received his last hand, or whether he intended to fill up the defective places*, is like to remain a secret | Di H 189 But *whether she ever tried or no*, lay hidden in her own closed heart | Seeley E 4 *Whether it would always go on brightening, or whether, like the physical day, it would pass again into afternoon and evening, or whether it would come to an end by a sudden eclipse*, all this was left in obscurity.

There is a curiously muddled expression in Sh Lr IV 6.34 *Why I do trifle thus with his dispaire*, Is done to cure it (the reason why I . . . is that I want to cure it). This reminds one of the modern colloquialism which makes a clause with *because* the subject of a sentence: Tarkington F 187 Just *because I'm here now* doesn't mean I didn't go, does it? *Because a person is in China right now* wouldn't have to mean he'd never been in South America, would it? | Walpole GM 221 *Because you're blind and know nothing of what goes on under your nose* is no reason that

other people's sight should be blinded too | London M 260 *Because I say Republicans are stupid*, does not make me a Socialist. Note *just* as with dependent questions, in Ade A 45 Just because a fellow calls on a girl is no sign that she likes him. *Why* and *because* combined Maxwell EG 420 he was implying that *why* he knew she had kept the promise was *because* he had been seeing Arnold. — Not infrequently in this case the clause is represented afterwards by *that*: Troll B 360 But *because he leaves the palace*, that is no reason why he should get into the deanery | Wells V 262 *Because your nerves were exposed* that was no excuse for my touching them | Mackenzie PR 290 *Because I don't write to him*, that is no reason why he shouldn't write to Mr. Ricketts.—These clauses with *because* are really disguised content-clauses.

**2.451.** An interrogative clause is very often the object of a verb. Examples of x-questions:

Sh Wiv III 3.192 your husband askt *who was in the basket* | I should like to know *what he did, and why and how he did it* | I don't see *where that could have been* | he could not tell (decide) *which way to go, nor what to do*: frequently thus with semi-articulate clauses. Cp also Di Do 193 Polly, who had passed heaven knows *how many* sleepless nights | Carlyle Rem 1.275 a man with nobody knows *how much* brains.

**2.452.** The clause is the object of a phrase which comes to mean the same thing as 'not to know' (cf below on omission of prepositions 2.7):

Defoe R 167 I was now at a great loss *which way to get home* | Bennett GS 96 She was at a loss *what to do* | Doyle M 150 *what that something may be* I give you my word that I have no more idea than you have | Stevenson T 155 they were at their wits' end *what to do* | Doyle Sh 3.86 She was at her wits' end *what to do*.

**2.46.** A dependent nexus-question used as the object of a verb may in Modern English have one of three forms, with *if*, with *whether* and with inverted word-order and no conjunction.

First, with *if*: Sh Merch II 7.10 How shall I know *if I doe choose the right*?

This use of *if* goes back to OE times (*gif*), and is in fact a very natural development, as there are many combinations in which it is hardly possible to distinguish between

a conditional and an interrogative clause, for instance "I hope you will tell me if you can come". We therefore see the same connexion between conditional clause and dependent question in other languages as well, Dan. jeg veed ikke *om* . . ., G. ich weiß nicht *ob* . . . (*ob* in the older language was used for a condition, where now *wenn* is said), It. non so *se* . . ., Fr. je ne sais pas *si* . . . How natural is the transition between the two ideas may be seen from the fact that the great French lexicographers, Littré and Darmesteter, do not at all distinguish the two uses.

On the other hand this use of *if* is hardly possible except after the verb: in the beginning of a sentence "If he can come" would suggest a condition only, and we must therefore say "Whether he can come, I very much doubt". But then, this position of the interrogative clause is not very frequent.

Both uses of *if* are found together in By D J 5.30 I wonder if (interr.) his appetite was good? Or if it were (cond., note the subjunctive), if (interr.) also his digestion? | Mackenzie S 1.315 I wonder, if you didn't know I was your brother, if we should have a sort of intuition about it | Kaye Smith T 81 He wondered, if (interr.) Lady Cockstreet saw his emotion, and if (cond.) she did whether (N.B.) she realized its cause | Maxwell F 184 I wonder *if* (interr.) you'll ever understand why people get fond of you—or if (cond.) you did know, whether (N.B.) you would lose some of your strength with us.

In former times *and* (in mod. eds. written *an*) might be used like *if* to introduce an interrogative clause: BJo 3.152 she asks me an I will wear her gown.

**2.4n.** *Whether* as an interrogative adverb or conjunction is developed from its use as a pronoun meaning 'which of two', see II 7.74. Its original, and still very frequent, use is in disjunctive questions, followed by *or*, or very often by *or whether*; but it is also very often used where the alternative possibility is not expressed, as in Swift 3.191 asking whether I were now settled for life.

**2.472.** As above, 2.452, the object clause need not be governed by a transitive verb, as a phrase may have the same meaning: I *have no idea* whether he'll be able to come. Cp also Di D 523 She had been *undecided*, on leaving Dover, whether or no to give the finishing touch to that renunciation.

**2.48.** The third way in which such interrogative clauses may be formed, is by keeping the inverted order of a direct question, though the person and tense may be shifted; there is no introductory conjunction. This form does not seem to be at all common before the middle of the nineteenth century: it is now extremely frequent in colloquial speech and in novels, but is not universally recognized by theorists. Storm, EPh 771 says: "Der gebrauch des direkten statt des abhängigen fragesatzes hat etwas störendes [?] und wird am besten vermieden". In Funk & Wagnalls' Dictionary we read under "Faulty Diction": "the mixture of direct and indirect is also wrong; as, 'he asked me would I go' ".

Examples: Defoe Rox 280 I put in questions two or three times of how handsome she was, and was she really so fine a woman as they talked of, and the like | Di D 211 I was wondering could she be Dr. Strong's son's wife, or could she be Mrs. Dr. Strong | ib 317 she whispered something, and asked was that enough | id Do 9 I put the question, was there anybody there that they thought would suit? | Thack E 1.2 I wonder shall History ever pull off her periwig and cease to be court-ridden? | Mrs Carlyle F 3.23 I went into Mr. Gigner's shop and inquired was anything the matter | Brontë V 142 May I inquire did she ever speak of me to you? | GE M 1.252 he had meant to imply, would she love him as well in spite of his deformity | Mrs Browning A 30 careless did it fit or no | Hardy L 185 Ned put his flat and final question, would she marry him, then and there | Shaw 1.119 I asked him wasnt he coming (very frequent in Shaw) | Wilde D 15 I wonder will you understand me? | Galsworthy P 2.22 Please Miss, the Missis says will you and Mr. Ernest please to move your things.

In most cases writers do not put any comma before clauses of this kind, thus implying that there is no pause, and that the tone goes on in the same way as if *whether* or *if* had been used. The question mark at the end of the clause is omitted as often as not, but the rise in tone at the end of the clause will generally not be as marked as in a direct question. One of the reasons why this construction has become so common is probably the feeling that *whether* is rather stiff, and that *if* may sometimes be mistaken for the conditional conjunction.

The construction is found in connexion with the conditional *if* in Di Do 218 Florence began to think, if she were to fall ill, if she were to fade like her dear brother, would he then know that she had loved him (Note the continuation with a content-clause: Yes, she thought if she were dying, he would relent.) | Williamson P 237 I fear we have not the full sympathy of Lord Lane.—If you mean, will I do anything to keep the two apart, I confess you haven't.

**2.4₉.** Sometimes a clause of this kind is placed parallel to other clauses or some other object: Di F 495 In answer to the doctor's inquiry how did it happen, and was any one to blame, Tom gives his verdict | Benson D 102 Last night he woke me up about half-past ten, to say that he had heard it cough several times, and did I think it was the whooping cough | Hope D 43 she asked her next door neighbour if he knew Lady Mickleham by sight, and had he seen her lately? | Wells T 39 she asked him more about Millie, and was she very lovely, and so on.

This is particularly frequent in messages like the following: Di D 155 I was sent up to Captain Hopkins with Mr. Micawber's compliments, and I was his young friend, and would Captain Hopkins lend me a knife and fork | Benson D 154 this led to his offering to go himself, and would Dodo come with him? | Doyle M 50 a note came up to the Dad saying that Mrs. A's servant was ill, and would he come at once | Mered EH 389 the carriage came for me, sir, in the afternoon, with your compliments, and would I come.

Cp also Locke GP 107 I'm to say *that, won't* the ladies have the sweet charity—those were his words—to drink their coffee with him upstairs?

## Interrogative Clauses after Prepositions.

**2.5₁.** An interrogative clause as the object of a preposition is found in the thirteenth century in Orrm (2.326 I se33de þær summ del off-hu Johaness Lerrninng-cnihhtess Token . . .), possibly under the influence of Danish usage, but otherwise it does not seem to occur till the end of the 17th century, and is not at all common till the 19th: even now, many purists object to such combinations and avoid them either by omitting the preposition (see below 2.7) or by using other turns.

In Sh Lr III 1.37 (quarto) "making iust report of how vnnaturall and bemadding sorrow The King hath cause to plaine" *of* must not be referred to *report*, but to *plain* (= complain) and thus does not govern the whole clause. Sh Tp III 1.52 "how features are abroad I am skillesse of" is slightly different from the examples given below, because *skilless of* comes after the clause: when Shakespeare framed the beginning, he probably had not yet this expression in his mind, but thought of something like "I know not".—The corresponding phenomenon is very frequent indeed in Scandinavian languages, but in German and Dutch it is in such cases necessary to insert a representative adverb: *davon wie, er van hoe* . . . I find in Spanish, Galdós, Doña Perfecta 131, "disertaban sobre cuales eran los mejores burros". The construction thus seems to have developed independently in various languages, as is quite natural considering that a clause of this description means much the same thing as might have been expressed by a substantive (how little we know = our ignorance; how he worked = his manner of working, etc.): no wonder therefore that the construction with a preposition should be extended from nouns to clauses. As the construction is not generally recognized, I shall give a good many examples.

**2.5₂.** Examples with *of*: Milton A 1 (see below 2.5₄) | Swift (quoted Bøgholm B 52) they gave hints of who and who's together | Defoe R 331 some information . . . of what was become of my partner | Southey L 352 neither he nor Murray are aware of how much depends upon the choice | Shelley PW 2.178 we grow dizzy to look down the dark abyss of how little we know | Peacock M 257 I have not the most distant notion of what is the matter | Lang E 107 Walter Scott's account of how he worked | Stevenson VP 160 we have no idea of what death is | ib 173 to be truly happy is a question of how we begin and not of how we

end, of what we want and not of what we have | Doyle S 2.112 I thought of the fifty guineas, and of how very useful they would be to me | Mered E 322 proof of how well he had disguised himself | Hardy F 159 without any idea of who it was to be | Dickinson S 7 he will give you the clearest possible account of why he is a Liberal | Galsw D 138 he told no one of where he had been | id Ca 817 the daily problem of how to get a job, and of why he had lost the one he had | Lawrence L 246 Leaving aside the question of whether you love me or I love you.

**2.53.** With other prepositions:

*about*: Bunyan P 58 my thoughts wax warm about whither I am going | GE A 434 did Seth say anything to thee about when he was coming? | Doyle S 4.176 have you formed any theory about how that bell rang? | id M 145 I want to tell you about how the practice has been going on | Shaw StJ 100 I shall not fuss about how the trick has been done | Walpole C 461 Didn't mother say anything about when she'd be in?

*at:* Wells TM 111 I could make only the vaguest guesses at what they [the machines] were for | NP Look at what education has done for the Indians.

*by:* Norris O 531 I never said he wasn't dead. I only said you couldn't always tell by whether his heart beat or not.

*from:* Wilde In 193 showing us the whole nature and life of the man, from what school of philosophy he affected, down to what horses he backed on the turf.

*in:* Shelley L 596 a very absurd interest in who is to be its next possessor.

*on* (*upon*)*:* Goldsm 653 they are in actual consultation upon what's for supper | NP '23 there is so little agreement upon what is to take its place (i. e. of Materialism) | (frequent after *depend*): Troll O 208 It must depend on how far the husband had been in fault.

*over:* Galsw D 15 she had brooded over how to make an end | Dane First the Bl. 164 to sit there and brood over whether you 're any good.

*to* (cf above *from*; very frequent *as to*): Tylor A 142 any one who will attend to how English words run together | Benson D 52 the doubt occurred as to whether any of it was genuine.

*with:* Lounsbury Ch 3.222 those who are best acquainted with how much has been accomplished are the most painfully aware of how much still remains to be accomplished | Doyle M 35 Scotland was to resound with how he had resuscitated me | Grattan L 240 we are not here concerned with the reality or non-reality of the action itself, but with whether the speaker presents it as an actuality or not.

It will be seen that the great majority of these clauses begin with an interrogatory pronoun or adverb (x-questions), but a few with *whether* (nexus-question) and none with *if* or without any interrogative word. In loose colloquial speech *if* clauses are beginning to be used after prepositions, Mackenzie writes, C 133 What about if I get married? | ib 357 you grumble sometimes, but how about if you was like me? Here, however, *if* is conditional rather than interrogative.

**2.5₄.** In all these cases the object of the preposition is the whole clause and not the one part of it that follows immediately after the preposition. This is seen most clearly when we find that it is possible to have two prepositions, one governing the whole clause and the other (usually placed at the end) governing the interrogative pronoun and thus itself forming part of the dependent clause. Examples: Mi A 1 the thought *of* whom it hath recourse *to* | Cowper L 1.34 he was questioned *about* what he was musing *on* | Sheridan 239 I never had the least idea *of* what you charge me *with* | Shelley L 887 I tremble to think *of* what poor Emilia is destined *to* | Brontë J 217 she had informed them *of* what they most wished *for* | GE M 1.88 that would depend *on* what they didn't like him *for* | Butler Er 127 take a juster view *of* what physical obliquity proceeds *from* (Wells TM 111 quoted 2.5₃) | Allen W 81 it is only a question *of with* whom I shall do so.

Note Stevenson B 2 but for whom they were to fight, and of where the battle was expected, Dick knew nothing. Here the writer uses *of* only in the second clause, avoiding it in the first on account of the other preposition *for*.

Occasionally one preposition does duty for two identical ones (by haplology): Maxwell EG 261 quite careless as to the amount of work that she did or as *to* what dark or even dangerous places the work led her | Jenkins B 219 Bindle's glance left no doubt in Mr. Winch's mind as *to* whom he referred.

**2.5₅.** Sometimes the clause is put first, and then the preposition comes behind, joined to the verb: Ru CWO 29 What ought to be done with them, we'll *talk of* another time. Cp 2.2₆ and Sh Tp, above, 2.5₁.

## Clauses of Wonder.

**2.6₁.** Clauses of wonder may be the object of a verb in the same way as interrogative clauses, which they resemble: Aust P 16 everybody said how well she looked | Carlyle F 4.220 you can fancy what two or three days I had | Bennett RS 263 He thought how odd it was | Mackenzie C 80 Mrs. Raeburn thought to herself as she left the room, how strange children were.

**2.6₂.** Clauses of wonder differ from interrogative clauses in requiring the indefinite article between the interrogative word and a substantive in the singular (if this is not a mass-word, II 5.213): (Ch Parl 564 herkeneth which a reson I shall bringe) | Sh Hml III 2.380 Why looke you now, how vnworthy a thing you make of me | id Tp I 2.252 Do'st thou forget From what a torment I did free thee? | Bunyan P 89 you cannot think what a flattering tongue she had | Southey L 68 when he is gone, nobody will believe what a mind goes with him | Di D 356 I know what a friendly heart you've got | Thack N 555 you may fancy with what a panic it filled the good lady | GE SM 35 everybody was saying what a handsome couple he and Miss Nancy would make! | Bennett W 1.100 every guest thought what an excellent thing it was that Baines should be dead | Rose

Macaulay P 4 she thought what a nice novel they would make.

**2.63.** This difference between a clause of wonder and an interrogative clause is not always clearly marked; one might perhaps have expected *what fate* instead of *what a fate* in Thack E 2.312 she escaped to France, to what a fate I disdain to tell. *What a* expresses a high degree of some quality (mentioned or understood), see, for instance Dickinson S 109 You don't understand, what a difficult position I am in | Quiller Couch M 253 it crossed his mind what a fool he had been and what a chance he had missed.

**2.64.** A clause of wonder may also sometimes be the object of a preposition: London A 102 I blush to think of what fools we were in those days | Finnemore Famous Engl. 2.195 he soon gave proof of what a wonderful leader he was.

**2.65.** It should be noted that very frequently expressions of wonder, though to all intents and purposes independent sentences, have the same word-order as dependent clauses, for instance:

Galsw P 2.7 How people can be such fools! (different from the question: how can people . . .) | Kipl K 375 How I shall laugh with the Colonel! (Here *how* indicates a degree; in "How shall I laugh" as a real question *how* would refer to the manner).

Such expressions originate in incomplete utterances: the speaker pulls up before saying the main clause: . . . I do not understand (aposiopesis).

### No Preposition before a Clause.

**2.71.** The general feeling that clauses governed by prepositions are clumsy constructions leads pretty often to the omission of a preposition which would be indispensable before a substantive. The term here used, "omission", should not be taken in the historical sense as implying that a preposition was formerly used in such cases which has

later fallen away: the tendency is rather in the opposite direction, of using prepositions more and more before clauses. The omission is the more natural, because in many cases there are related or synonymous expressions which require no preposition: *is not ignorant = knows*, *forgetful = forgetting*, *gave an account = told*, etc.

**2.7₂.** *Of* omitted: Sh Gent I 3.25 I thinke your lordship is not ignorant How his companion . . . Attends the Emperor | Bacon A 8 in expectation what would be done with us | Mi PL 4.54 Forgetful what from him I still receive | Defoe R 2.128 they gave me an account how many ways they strove | ib 125 they put one another in mind that there was a God | Swift 3.101 he seemed to be wholly ignorant what they were | Cowper L 1.185 she might become sensible in a few days that she had acted hastily | Troll B 166 surprised and ignorant what the lady alluded to | Wells Fm 178 I was rashly sanguine that we should recover the sphere | Hope D 15 in future I am going to be careful what I do | Ru Sel 1.245 reckless what comes of it | Kipl L 273 take care your throat's not cut | Mackenzie C 36 I have my own idea what's good for Jenny (cf above 2.3₅) | I am not sure this is right = That this is right, I am not sure.

It will be seen that the omission occurs equally before content-clauses with and without *that* and before dependent questions; parallel to the latter we find Doyle M 122 you've no idea the trouble I had to get him in [= no idea what trouble I had; or = you don't know the trouble I had].

Note the double construction in Goldsm V 2.139 And are you *sure of* all this, are you *sure that* nothing ill has befallen my boy?

**2.7₃.** Other prepositions omitted.

*For:* Kipl L 105 it is outside my business to care what people say | Herrick M 218 perhaps she cares more what folks say than I do | he is responsible that the letter is delivered.

*On:* Defoe M 118 depending that he would say nothing | Bennett C 2.280 it all depends how you handle him (thus

often with *depend*) | id A 228 you might rely he would not hoard it up | Bennett T 27 I insisted he should come up with us | Mackenzie C 27 she set up a commotion of tears because she insisted the ladies behind the counter were laughing at her | id S 715 I'm frightfully keen you should marry Stella.

*About:* Lamb E 2.VI he gave himself little concern what he uttered, and in whose presence | Ru S 171 they quarrelled violently which pieces they would have.

*To*, cf above 2.2$_7$: Sh Hml I 3.59 And these few precepts in thy memory *See* thou character | Stev JHF 82 I shall make it my business to see you are no loser | Locke FS 328 I'll see nothing unpleasant happens. Cf also Macaulay H 1.132 they would not *consent* that he should assume the regal title.

---

## Chapter III.

## Relative Clauses as Primaries.

**3.1**$_1$. A relative clause can be employed as a primary in the following three positions.

First, as the subject of a sentence, for instance:
*Who steales my purse*, steales trash (Sh Oth III 3.157).
*Whoever says so* is a liar.
*What you say* is quite true.
*What money I have* is at your disposal (A).
*Whatever I get* is at your disposal.

Second, as the object of a verb:
You may marry *whom you choose.*
You may take *which of the apples you like.*
He wants to shoot *whoever comes near him.*
He will take *what you offer him.*
She will give you *what money she has* (A).
He will take *whatever comes his way.*
She will eat *whatever sweets* you give her (A).

Third, as the object of a preposition:
You may dance with *whom you like.*
He will shoot at *whoever comes near him.*
He only laughed at *what we said.*
He will be thankful for *what help you can offer him* (A).
He will pay attention to *whatever you may say.*

She went through *whatever paces her owner demanded of her* (Thack N 396) (A).

**3.1₂.** The analysis here offered as the only natural one is that it is the clause itself in its entirety that is the subject or object[1]. This is opposed to the way in which such clauses are regarded in other grammars. In these we find, as a matter of fact, two different views, both of which lead into unsurmountable difficulties when thought out in all their consequences (cf my criticism in PG 103 f.). The deepest-lying reason, perhaps, why the nature of these constructions has not been understood, is that the compound pronouns *whoever*, etc., have been singled out as a separate class, "indefinite relative pronouns", and grammarians therefore have overlooked the fundamental similarity of all the clauses placed together in 3.1₁ as one and the same class. Another reason for the unsatisfactory treatment of these clauses is that the parallelism mentioned in 3.5₂ has escaped notice.

[1] It may not be superfluous here expressly to indicate how such a sentence as "What money he had left was at our disposal" should be analyzed according to the system here advocated: the whole clause *what money he had left* is the subject, thus a primary; in this clause *what money* is the object, the two words together thus form a primary, but the combination consists of *what*, which is an adjunct, and *money*, which in relation to *what* is a primary. If we had said, "The money he had left was at our disposal", the subject would have been the whole combination *the money he had left*, in which the contact-clause *he had left* is an adjunct to *money*.—The use of the plural *were* is interesting in Mackenzie C 145 Indeed, what mistakes she made were due to wisdom rather than folly: the whole combination *what mistakes she made* is naturally treated as a plural idea.

**3.1₃.** The first view is found, for instance, in Onions AS: a relative pronoun refers to a noun or noun-equivalent called the antecedent, expressed or implied in the principal clause (§ 62): in Pope's "To help who want, to forward who excel" the antecedent *those* is omitted (§ 64). Now this theory of omission or ellipsis can be applied neither to *what* nor to *whoever* or *whatever*, for nothing can be supplied before these pronouns, and yet the clauses are relative clauses; but then Onions does not speak of *what* as relative: but can it be anything else in "I admired what you said" or the examples given above?

Sonnenschein also is an advocate of the ellipsis view, see § 306 "Who breaks pays. An antecedent must be supplied . . . The subject of the main verb 'pays' is not the clause 'who breaks' but the antecedent 'he', which is understood. The clause 'who breaks' is, therefore, an adjective-clause, qualifying the subject *he*". Similarly in § 93 (*what*)—but isn't it rather strange that the antecedent which is understood, namely *that*, cannot, as a matter of fact, be put before *what*: if we use *that* we must let it be followed by *which*, not by *what*, but this alters the whole grammatical structure of the combination. In § 96 he speaks of *whoever*, etc.: these words, too, generally have no antecedent expressed—I should rather say: never. Sonnenschein says that *whoever* = 'anyone who', but it is impossible to introduce this 'antecedent' before *whoever* in Sonnenschein's example and say: Anyone whoever wanted to go went. It is also very curious that Sonnenschein calls *that* in "Whatever I have promised, that I will perform" the antecedent of *whatever*.

The impossibility of the ellipsis explanation is seen very clearly in the case of such sentences as "You may marry whom you like", for this means something quite different from "You may marry him whom you like"—but these sentences have not been discovered at all by our grammarians. And further, what could be supplied in the cases in which *what* is adjunct (marked A above)? So I think we may dismiss the ellipsis theory.

**3.1₄.** The other view is taken by Sweet, who repudiates the idea of ellipse and calls these pronouns condensed relative pronouns, because *what* unites the grammatical functions of the two words *something* and *which* (why not rather *that* and *which*?). But it is not correct to say, as Sweet does, that in "what you say is true" *what* is at the same time the object of say and the subject of is, for if we ask "What is true?" the answer will not be *what*, but *what you say*. I have mentioned other objections to Sweet's view in PG 104, and shall here add that in the following paragraphs (221 ff.) he creates a new and entirely unnecessary category of 'conjunctive pronouns', because he does not see clearly the difference between a relative and a dependent interrogative clause. But let us now turn to the grammatical facts instead of further criticizing the views of other grammarians.

**3.2.** It will be noticed that the relative word itself may fill different functions in the clause, entirely independent of the function of the clause itself: in the sentences marked (A) in 3.1₁ the relative is an adjunct.

A particularly interesting case is found when the relative pronoun is governed by a preposition at the end of the clause, while the whole clause is the object of a preceding preposition (cp interrogative clauses 2.5₄):

Sh H 5 I 2.19 in approbation Of *what your reuerence shall incite vs to* | id Gent II 7.84 To take a note of *what I stand in need of* | Massinger N IV 3.25 being dispossesst of *what it longs for* | Swift 3.111 I was able to call for *whatever I had a mind to* | Ru S 32 I had been writing of *what I knew nothing about* | Galsw Ca 163 his glance travelled to the heart of *what it rested on* | ib 460 nothing would ever turn him from acquisition of *what he had set his heart on.*

Where, however, it is the same preposition that should be used both before and inside the clause, it is sometimes put only once (cf 2.5₄, 10.5₂):

Latimer (Spec 3.XXI. 273) He should therfore gyue it ouer *to whom it is meete* | Sh H4A III 4.3 beare . . . all

the rest *To whom they are directed* | AV Rom 9.18 Therefore hath hee mercie *on whom hee will haue mercy* | ib 13.7 Render therfore . . . tribute *to whom tribute is due* | Keats 2.149 Now comes the pain of truth, *to whom 'tis pain* | Sh Oth II 2.7 each man *to what sport and reuels his addition leads him.*

**3.31.** *Who* (with *whoever*, etc.) is the only one of these pronouns that has a separate oblique case-form *whom* (*whomever*). The general relation between the two case-forms as well as the conflict between the natural instinct, which has for centuries tended to use the form *who* everywhere, and the endeavours of grammarians to keep up the distinction will be illustrated and discussed elsewhere (see, provisionally Progr. and ChE.): here we are only concerned with the special difficulties arising from the fact that the clause as such may have a different function from that of the pronoun as such—a fact which has led even careful writers astray in their endeavours to write "grammatically".

**3.32.** There is no difficulty when *who* is the subject of the clause, while at the same time the whole clause is the subject of the main sentence, thus Sh Oth III 3.157 *Who steales my purse*, steales trash | Mi A 6 *who kills a man kills a reasonable creature*, Gods image, but hee who destroyes a good booke, kills reason it selfe | Lang, Lost Love: *Who wins his love* shall lose her, Who loses her shall gain . . . Oh, happier he who gains not The love some seem to gain | Caine E 297 *who says man* says misery. Note here the variation in the second and third quotations.

**3.33.** Where the pronoun is the subject of the clause, *who* (*whoever*) would seem to be the grammatically correct form, even where the whole clause is itself the object, but as a matter of fact many writers use the form *whom*(*so*)*ever* in such cases, chiefly, it may be conjectured, in order not to seem ignorant of the distinction between *who* and *whom*.

*Who* is used in Mi PL 3.361 in hope To find *who might direct his wandring flight* | Kingsley Farewell: Be good, sweet maid, and let *who can* be clever (*who can* is part of a nexus, "acc. w. inf.") | he was angry with *whoever crossed*

*his path* | Wordsw 167 pleasure . . . to be claimed by *whoever shall find* | Taylor (NED) Mental disorders which demand, in *whoever would relieve them*, the very purest intentions.

Examples of *whom* in this position: Mackenzie S 573 he had to inform *whomsoever should open it* that he had once lived in this very house | NP '19 power to summon *whomsoever might throw light upon the events.*—After a preposition: Scott Iv 305 to bring ruin on *whomsoever hath shown kindness to me* | Di D 456 Peggotty always volunteered this information to *whomsoever would receive it* | Hawth S 35 they shall be freely exhibitioned to *whomsoever*, induced by the great interest of the narrative, *may desire a sight of them* | Hardy F 117 for the benefit of *whomsoever should call* | Crawford Cigarette 109 to the direct injury of *whomsoever chanced to possess it* | Walpole SC 204 she talked nonsense to *whomsoever was near to her* | Rogers Wine of F 255 in the path of *whomsoever went by* | W. de la Mare, Bookman May '08 Herrick had been known to fling his sermon at *whom soever snored* | Mackenzie S 894 winking over her shoulder at *whomever would watch her comedy* | London M 41 to pay heed to *whomsoever talked to him* | James Am 1.267 She sat by the fire conversing with *whomsoever approached her* | Chambers Beowulf 371 The King offers half his kingdom to *whomsoever will destroy the beast.* (All my examples contain the form *whomsoever*).

NED has examples of *whomever* used in this way from Wyclif and Peacock, but not from modern writers, and of *whomsoever* "used ungrammatically" from 1560 to Ruskin.

**3.34.** *Whom* is correct when it is the object in a clause that is the subject of the main sentence:

Byron BJ 4.12 *Whom the gods love* die young | Mrs. Browning A 231 *Whom I marry* shall be noble.—Here we may place also Swinburne A 65 fairer than *whom all men praise.*

**3.35.** *Whom* is, of course, required by traditional grammar when both the pronoun and the clause are the

object (of a verb or preposition): Mi PL 2.249 Eternity so spent in worship paid *To whom we hate* | Shelley 260 the souls *of whom thou lovest* | id 716 I feed *on whom I fed* [= on those to whom I gave food] | Lewis MA 400 with Martin and Leora, or *with whomsoever he could persuade* to come.

But *who* is found, for instance, in Sh Wint V 1.109 [she would] make proselytes *of who she but bid follow* | Ro V 3.173 Go some of you, *who ere you find* attach [i. e. seize whomever you find] | H8 II I.47 And generally, *who euer the King fauours*, The Cardinall instantly will finde imployment. Some modern examples below 3.5₃.

**3.3₆.** With regard to the genitive *whose*, which is rare in these clauses, we must distinguish between two different employments. First the genitive may be governed by a word in the relative clause: Mi PL 8.647 Sent from *whose sovran goodness I adore.* This is entirely unnatural, quasi-Latin, for *from him whose . . .*

Second, the whole relative clause is, as it were, put in the genitive case: BJo 3.269 I will become *whose slave you will give me to* for ever [i. e. the slave of [him] whom you will give me to] | Mi PL 6.808 Vengeance is his or *whose he sole appoints.*

**3.4₁.** *What* as a relative without an antecedent is extremely frequent; it is used both generically (= *all that*) and of a single thing. The following examples may suffice:

Sh Tp I 2.369 If thou . . . dost vnwillingly *what I command*, Ile racke thee with old crampes | Carlyle R 2.330 This, and *what of faculty I did recognize in this man* gave me a clear esteem of him | Carlyle (Tenn L 1.248) there is in me *what would fill whole lachrymatories* | Hope Z 205 Is that *what brings you to Zenda?* | Shaw 2.283 Is *what Dolly told me* true?

It is curious to note that this use, which is now so familiar to us, is hardly at all found in the AV, which has *that that* or *that which*, or frequently *that* alone.

**3.4₂.** *What* in the plural: Brontë P 100 these girls belonged to *what are called* the respectable ranks of society |

Mill L 115 to point out when *what were once truths* are true no longer | Merriman V 279 There are few paths through the great forests of Poland, and *what there are*, are usually cut straight.

**3.43.** *But what* after a negative expression is used in the neuter sense of 'except what': Sh Shr V 2.14 Padua affords nothing but what is kinde. This usage presents nothing that is really surprising; *what* has here its ordinary value, and *but* is a preposition as so very often. The relative clause is a primary, but if we transcribe it by means of *not* in the clause, this of course becomes a clause adjunct: Padua affords nothing that (or which) is not kind.

Other examples: Defoe R 2.4 I had no agreeable diversion but what had some thing or other of this in it | Quincey 220 political economy is eminently an organic science (no part, but what acts on the whole) | Benson D 2.129 there is nothing else about me but what is intolerable | Bennett A 20 there is no village lane within a league but what offers a travesty of rural charms.

**3.44.** It is more difficult to account for the personal use of *but what* = 'who . . . not'. This is exemplified in NED (what C 5) only from 1662 (Evelyn), 1688 (South) and 1788 (Bentham): I may therefore be allowed to print my own examples from writers of greater literary repute: they also show that the idiom did not die out with the eighteenth century:

Swift 3.54 there are few persons of distinction . . . but what can hold conversation in both tongues | id J 489 there is not one of the ministry but what will employ me | Goldsm V 1.22 He observed that . . . scarce a farmer's daughter within ten miles round but what had found him successful | Austen E 29 not that I think Mr. M would ever marry any body but what had had some education | ead. P 306 there is not one of his tenants but what will give him a good name | GE A 98 There's nobody round that hearth but what's glad to see you | Stevenson T 99 I never heard of a crew that meant mutiny but what showed signs before.

**3.45.** *What* is used very often as an adjunct: Sh Tp Ep 2 And *what strength I haue*'s mine own | Bunyan P 27 to do *what hurt and mischief they could* | Thack S 56 a merchant may wear *what boots he pleases* | Carlyle R 1.4 I give way to *what thoughts rise in me* | ib 183 reading *what few books I could get* | Di Do 144 the old man lost *what little self-possession he ever had* | GE A 265 I shall take *what measures I think proper* | Tenn L 2.189 I do not like the mildew to grow over *what little memory you may have of me* | Ru P 1.265 with *what best of girl-nature was in them* | Hewlett Q 464 I bore that with *what face I could.*

This is rare with words meaning persons: Kingsley H 366 he is to come with *what Goths* he can muster.

Note especially the following combinations in which one might feel inclined to look upon *little* and *few* as adjunct, though they are rather the primaries: Thack H 59 from *what little* I have seen of you, you seem to be honest | Stev M 114 cling to *what little* we can get | Kipl P 171 I've taught you *what little* you know about hunting | Butler ER 92 your son lets his men wear *what few* of the old clothes they may still have.

**3.46.** The following quotations illustrate a type of clause which will be mentioned below sub *who* (3.55): Ch MP 12.23 Do *what you list*, I wil your thral be founde | Sh H 4 A 1.2.162 come *what will*, Ile tarry at home | Swift J 324 I won't answer your letter yet, say *what you will* | Scott A 1.223 we'll eat the fish, cost *what it will* | Sh Ado II 3.84 I had as liefe haue heard the night-rauen, come *what plague could haue come* after it | Thack N 25 he swore, *come what would*, he would never strike him again.

With *can*: Marl E 1022 Do *what they can*, weele liue in Tinmoth here | Sh As I 3.107 Say *what thou canst*, Ile goe along with thee | Sterne 33 it was a difficult thing, do *what he could*, to keep the discourse free from obscurity.

**3.47.** If we say *what . . . and what . . .*, reference is made to two different things: I admire what he says and what he does | the difference between what is asserted

and what is proved. But if the same thing is meant, it is necessary in the second place to use the pronoun *which* (rarer *that*): this to some extent may be taken as an indication that the popular speech-instinct feels *what* as equivalent to *that which*:

Shelley PW 2.184 to assert *what* cannot be proved to be either true or false, *but which*, were it true, annihilates all hope of existence after death | Austen P 464 she was not backward to credit *what* was for the advantage of her family, *or that* came in the shape of a lover to any of them | NP 09 his lips will condemn *what* the hand has done, *but to which* his real mind has never given assent | Galsw T 78 avoiding *what* we should all regret, *but which* I fear will otherwise become inevitable.

The same with *whatever*: Hawth S 160 it steals the substance out of *whatever realities* there are around us, *and which* were meant by Heaven to be a spirit's joy.

This of course is different from such cases as the following, where a new clause with a perfectly regular *which* is added as adjunct to the *what*-clause: NP 99 What he gave her, which was little enough, he gave to please M.

**3.51.** While *what* is thus used freely in relative clause primaries, the same is not true of *which* and *who*. *Which* without an antecedent (as in Ch A 796 And which of you that bereth him best of alle . . . Shal have a soper) is not found in natural language in the MnE period, except in the cases mentioned 3.56. *Who* is much more common, chiefly in a generic sense, which is seen very clearly when we compare three forms of the same proverb: Galsw P 12.61 *Who* touches pitch, shall be defiled | AV Ecclus 13.1 *He that* toucheth pitch, shal be defiled therewith | Sh Ado III. 3.60 *they that* touch pitch will be defil'd—the meaning being 'anyone that, everyone that, all those who'.

Sentences like "Who steals my purse steals trash" and many of those given above are not colloquial nowadays, and seem always to have been literary; their frequency is probably due to imitation of Latin and, to some extent,

French syntax. Latin influence (*sunt qui*) is indubitable in such sentences as Bosw 1. 127 there were who felt and acknowledged its [the Rambler's] uncommon excellence | H. Coleridge (NED) there are who have spoken of Wordsworth as the stamp-master.

*Who* after *as* in *as who should say or says* (less frequently with other verbs) must be placed with the other relatives in clause primaries, though the relation to the main clause is obscure: the meaning is "as if one said . . .". It is very fully illustrated in NED from 1297 on: in spite of the early occurrence it is probably imitated from the French *comme qui dirait*, etc., though is may have arisen independently, cf the parallels from ON, Old Dan., and Greek mentioned in Sandfeld Jensen, *Bisætningerne i moderne fransk*, København 1909, p. 91. I shall give only two examples: Sh H6A I 4.93 He smiles on me, As who should say, When I am dead and gone, Remember to avenge me | Di Do 187 he shows his teeth, as who should say "Dear me!"

**3.5₂.** There is however, one condition on which such relative clause primaries may be used in natural speech, namely that the generic meaning (i. e. indifference of choice) is expressly indicated. This may be done in one of two ways, either by means of the added adverb *ever* (*whoever*, with the archaic variants *whoso*, *whosoever*), or else by such a verb as *choose*, *please*, *like*, *would* in the clause itself (cp also *no matter who*). The parallelism between these two idioms, and, in fact, the peculiarity of the latter kind of clauses, have never been noticed by grammarians, so far as I know.

**3.5₃.** Let us take first those clauses in which indifference of choice is indicated by means of a verb. It is possible to say "Tom may marry *whom he chooses* (*pleases*, *likes*)", but if *likes* is the verb used, it means the same thing as the two other verbs, and has no reference to Tom's personal feelings, for it is impossible to say, for instance, "He is going to marry whom he dislikes". But this restriction has not always obtained. Sh writes (Merch I 2.25) "I may neither choose *whom I would*, nor refuse *whom I dislike*": the former, but not the latter expression would be allowable in colloquial English nowadays. We see the difference clearly in the two constructions used by Ruskin S 9 we cannot know

*whom we would*; and *those whom we know*, we cannot have at our side.

Further quotations to illustrate this:

Sh As II 7.49 I must haue liberty . . . To blow on *whom I please* | Defoe G 45 Let the patent be bought by *who it will* | Goldsm 676 Constance may marry *whom she pleases* | Brontë V 122 She had the art of pleasing *whom she would* | ib 135 M Paul, then, might dance with *whom he would* | Hope King's M 13 waiting till I could fling my shoes at *whom I would* | Mackenzie C 355 I marry *who I please* | Butler W 107 let *who will* be against you | Yeats 63 I would be master here, And ask in [adv.] what I pleased or *who I pleased* | Milne Mr Pim 21 Let her choose *whom she likes* as long as he can support her | Galsw FM 292 I'll go *with whom I choose* | Dreiser F 21 courting *whom she pleased* and ignoring all others. — Note here the natural *who* for *whom* in some of the quotations.

**3.5₄.** The genitive is rare:

Brontë J 222 they are all at liberty to be the recipients of *whose smiles they please* | Hardy R 313 I shall accept *whose company I choose.*

**3.5₅.** *Who* is common in an interesting type of clause (also implying indifference of choice) in which the relative word is preceded by a verb; the same type is also found with *how*, *where*, etc.; the verbal form (infinitive, subjunctive or imperative?) will be discussed elsewhere; here a few examples with *who* may serve as illustrations: Roister 85 For haue his anger *who lust*, we will not by the roode | Mi PL V 62 Forbid *who will*, none shall from me withhold | Brontë J 472 I am convinced that, go when and *with whom I would*, I should not live long in that climate | Ru T 94 I will say my say to the end, mock at it *who may.*

Examples of *what* in such clauses have already been given (3.4₆).

**3.5₆.** *Which* is rarer in clauses of this kind; the reason is the same as with *whichever* (3.6₇): Mi PR 3.370 Chuse *which thou wilt*, by conquest or by league | Shaw A 186 So you

can come back or go to the devil: *which you please* | Stev JHF 21 He might see a reason for his friend's strange preference or bondage (call it which you please) | Butler Er 297 Be killed or kill; choose which you will | you may take *which of the apples you like* (but not applied to persons; one does not say: you may dance with which of the girls you choose).

This use of *which* seems to have escaped the notice of grammarians: Sweet (§ 220) expressly says, 'Only *who* and *what* are used as condensed relatives." It is curious that the differentiation between *who* and *which* is the same as with the interrogatives, cf 6.82.

**3.57.** *Whether* ('which of two'; in Mod. E. the word is generally confined to use as an adverb or conjunction) is seen in a relative clause primary of this type in More U 141 he occupyethe whether [which of the two crafts] he wyll. This is now completely extinct; some other old examples may be found in NED *whether* I.3 (with the strange definition: In generalized or indef. sense).

**3.61.** Next we have the second of the two ways mentioned above (3.52) of indicating expressly the generic quality or indifference of choice in relative clauses, namely the addition to the pronoun of an indefinite adverb, as in *whoever*, *whatever*. The adverb is generally written not as a separate word, but as part of a compound pronoun, and in the ordinary grammars these pronouns are given as a separate class, termed *indefinite relative pronouns*. There is, however no reason why they should be set up as a class by themselves: they are not more indefinite in their meaning than the simple *who* or *what* of most of the sentences quoted in the preceding sections, (or for that matter *he that* or *he who* in many sentences): the really characteristic trait of the clauses introduced by the compounds with *-ever* is that they are not adjuncts as are most relative clauses.

Various adverbs joined to the pronouns give us the following types:

*whoso*

*whosoever* with the variant *whosomever*

*whoever*.

**3.62.** *Whoso* began to appear as early as the late OE period (*hwa swa* instead of the still earlier *swa hwa swa*), see E. A. Kock, *The Engl. Rel. Pronouns*, Lund 1897. 67; Trampe Bødtker, *Crit. Contrib. to Early Engl. Syntax*, Christiania 1910 13. It is frequent in ME, e. g. Orrm 2.335 (*whase*), AR 212 (so hit is sikerliche to *whamso* is idel of god), 280 (uorte smiten *hwam se* ualleð adun: note in both instances the case-form *wham*, cf above), Ch D 389 (*Whoso* that first to mille comth, first grint), etc. *So* might be separated from the pronoun: Ch E 156 *what* man *so* ye smyte.

*Whoso* is found only once in the undoubted works of Shakespeare (R 2), but three times in the doubtful plays (H6A Tim, Per.), it is found in Kyd, AV, Mi, Pope, Wordsw and Shelley, but has never been very frequent in the Modern English period. In recent writers it is very rare indeed and always has an archaic flavour: Kipl L 24 they had good reason to know that *whoso* was left outside would probably die. Ruskin U 13 quotes the biblical: *Whosoever* will save his life shall lose it, *whoso* loses it shall find it. But the AV, Mark 8.35 has *whosoeuer* in both clauses.

*Whatso* is even rarer: it is found neither in Kyd, Sh, AV, Mi, Pope, Wordsw, nor in Shelley. But in the nineteenth century it has been artificially revived by a few writers: Carlyle SR 89 whatso we have done, is done | Morris EP 103 Yea, do whatso thou wilt | Hewlett Q 12 you may be queen of whatso realm you please.

**3.63.** *Whosoever* (formerly also *whosoe'er*, originally a colloquial pronunciation, which was later admitted in poetry), an expanded form of *whoso*, seems never to have been very frequent in the spoken language. It is found four times in Kyd, but in the undoubtedly genuine Shakespearean plays only twice (three times in the doubtful plays), once in Milton's poems, never in Pope, a few times in Wordsw and Shelley. It is comparatively frequent in the Bible and is found here and there in recent prose-writers, chiefly perhaps in reminiscences from the Bible. MacCarthy writes 2.145

Mr. Bright was for a Reform Bill, from whomsoever it should come.

*Whatsoever* (*whatsoe'er*) may have been more colloquial than *whosoever*, at any rate it is much more frequent in Sh. But Pope avoided it, and from the beginning of the nineteenth century it has exactly the same archaic flavour as *whosoever*.

The adverb *soever* is sometimes separated from the pronoun: this is quite natural (though not used in colloquial English nowadays) when *what* is an adjunct to the substantive separating the two words, as in Sh Cymb III 5.112 *what villainy soere* I bid thee do | Walton A 95 *what worms soever* you fish with | Bunyan G 11 *what religion soever* I followed | Defoe R 303 *in what part of the world soever* I would send him | Cowper L 1.379 whensoever, and whatsoever, and *in what manner-soever* you please | Johnson L 3.208 *what reason soever* he might give. But it is very unnatural in Swinb T 133 for *who* sets eye thereon *soever* knows . . .

**3.6₄.** *Whosomever* and *whatsomever* were probably felt to be variants of *whosoever* and *whatsoever*, though historically they are expansions of ME *whosom*, *whatsom*, which contain the ME relative particle *sum* of Scandinavian origin. Sh has *whosomever* only once (and in one of the doubtful plays at that, Troil II 1.61), but *whatsomever* three times in genuine plays. These forms are not found in AV and seem to have been completely extinct since the seventeenth century, except in some dialects, where the form *whosumdever* also occurs; Kaye Smith GA 146 (ib 149 [incorrectly?] interrogatively Wotsumdever did he bring we there fur?).

**3.6₅.** The pronouns containing *-ever* have for centuries been much more colloquial than the forms mentioned hitherto. The earliest example of *whoever* in NED is from 1175, the earliest of *whatever* is from 1375. Wyclif uses both forms, but Chaucer does not, unless we will reckon the two solitary occurrences in the *Romance of the Rose* as genuine (*whoever* 3434, *whatever* 2430). Kyd has *whatever*, but not

*whoever*, both are frequent in Sh. They are not at all found in AV, but Milton, Swift, Pope, Gray and probably all other writers of the last three centuries use both *whoever* and *whatever* so frequently that I need give no examples here, besides those found where the case-forms were discussed. An example from Mill of *whoever* with a plural verb is given in II 6.45.

**3.6₆.** What is the genitive of these combinations with *who*? I have found the following combinations, the first of which is the most common one in literary English:

*Whosesoever:* AV John 20.23 Whose soeuer sinnes yee remit, they are remitted vnto them, and whose soeuer sinnes ye retaine, they are retained | Johnson L 2.61 The poem, whose soever it was, has much virulence | Carlyle FR 284 Come whosesoever head is hot | Ru CWO 9 in whosesoever hands it may be, it must be spent.

*Whose . . . soever:* Sh John IV 3.91 whose tongue so ere speakes false, not truely speakes | R 3 IV 4.224 Whose hand soeuer lanch'd their tender hearts.

*Whosoever's:* Shelley's father (in letter, Ingpen, Shelley in Engl. 219) therefore into *whosoever's* hand this comes will have the goodness to find out the right person (i. e. anyone into whose hands . . .)

*Whose ever:* Goldsm 637 I would not hurt a hair of her head,whose ever daughter she may be | Hergesheimer MB 294 It's mine now, whose ever it was a while back.

*Whoever's:* Mrs Parr, Peter Trotman: The lovely creatures in my imagination took the form of the Matilda, Julia, Fanny, or whoever's image at that moment filled my breast | NP '13 Whoever's hand that may have been.

Curme CG 45 gives the forms *whoseever*, *whoever's* (colloquial), *whosesoever*, and says, p 46 "*whose ever* (older form, now more commonly *whosever* or *whoever's*)". NED has two examples of *whosever* (none of those above) and three of *whosesoever*, none of *whosoever's* or *whoever's*.

**3.6₇.** *Whichever* is much rarer than either *whoever* or *whatever*, the natural reason being the conflict between the

generalization expressed in the ending *-ever* and the specialization implied in *which*, for the curious thing is that in these clause primaries the differentiation between *who* and *which* is not the same as in the ordinary relative clauses (clause adjuncts), where now *who* is confined to persons and *which* to things (these terms taken here in a broad meaning: details will be found below in chapter VI), but the same as in interrogative pronouns[1]: *which* (and *whichever*) particularizes, refers to a choice between a definite number, while *who* (*whoever*) and *what* (*whatever*) are universal or indefinite (cf II 7.82).

*Whichever* (*whichso*, *whichsoever*) is found neither in Ch, Kyd, Sh, AV, Mi, Pope nor Shelley. *Whichso* apparently died out in the fourteenth century, though NED has an example from William Morris, who artificially revived this as well as many other extinct words. There was more vitality in *whichsoever*, though that too is rare. I give from my own collections some recent examples of *whichever* illustrating its use in speaking of persons, which is the clearest indication of the fact that the differentiation here agrees with that in the interrogative pronouns:

McKenna S 194 It was agreed that whichever first received news of the wanderers should communicate with the other | Butler W 179 the subject was Elijah or Elisha (whichever it was) | Ward F 370 Her sister—or her friend—whichever it was—was an uncommonly pretty girl | (heard:) whichever of you goes must ride the bicycle | (heard:) one of the two men, whichever it was, once told me . . .

NED has not a single example of this *whichever* applied to persons, but among the examples of *whichsoever* it has from Southey: Saying that to whichsoever God should give the victory, to him also would he give up the kingdom.

---

[1] I expressed this as early as 1885 in my *Kortfattet eng. grammatik* by saying that "ever added to the interrogative pronouns gave these an indefinite relative meaning".—Note also the use of *whether* (3.57): NED has also examples of *whetherever*, *whetherso*, *whethersoever*, all of which became extinct in the beginning of the Mod. E. period.

*Whichever* is an adjunct (but the clause is primary): Locke BV 172 human beings, of whichever sex they may be, will do amazing things | Butler W 112 Dr. Skinner's pupils distinguished themselves at whichever University they went to.

The addition of the words *in the world* has the same generalizing effect as *-ever* in Sh Lr V 3.97 *What in the world* he is That names me traitor, villain-like he lies. *Ever* is strengthened in Shaw D 64 Oh, go and do *whatever the devil* you please.

**3.71.** Relative *that* used of a person without an antecedent, thus in a clause primary, is rare. We have it in the proverb "Handsome is *that handsome does*", which the American philosopher Royce imitates (Race Questions 1908, 240) "Loyal is *that loyally does*". Further examples:

Mal 237 thou to loue *that loueth not the*, is but grete foly | Sh Lr I 4.278 Woe, *that too late repents* | id Alls IV 2.75 Marry *that will*, I liue and die a maid | AV Prov. 13.7 There is *that maketh himselfe rich, yet hath nothing:* there is *that maketh himselfe poore, yet hath great riches.*—In the following quotations it is found with a plural verb (cp Lat. *sunt qui...*): Sh Tp II 1.262 There be *that can rule Naples* As well as he that sleepes | AV 1 Cor 8.5 though there bee *that are called gods.*

Neutral *that* = 'what' is much more frequent, see vol. II 16.355 the discussion of the difficulty of distinguishing between stressed demonstrative *that* [ðæt] with a contact-clause and unstressed relative *that* [ðət] without an antecedent; in some cases the metre shows which is meant.

In the following sentences we are perhaps justified in taking *that* as the relative [ðət]: Ch MP 3.42 *That wil not be*, moot nede be left | Caxton R 88 now gyue to me *that ye promysed* | Sh Err I 1.96 Gather the sequel by *that went before* | Sh Alls IV 1.49 Is it possible he should know what hee is, and be *that he is* | AV John 13.27 *That thou doest*, doe quickly (20th Cent.: Do what you are going to do at once) | Luke 19.21 thou takest vp *that thou layedst* not downe, and *reapest that thou didst not sow.*

Examples in which it is natural or even necessary to take *that* as the demonstrative with a following contact-clause will be given in 7.3₃.

**3.7₂.** Relative clause primaries may also begin with relative adverbs (*where*, *when*, &c.). The fact that these words themselves are subjuncts in the relative clause has no influence on the rank of the clause as such.

It is comparatively rare to have such clauses as the subject or predicative of a sentence: *Where he was mistaken* was in his contempt for the headmaster | Galsw Ca 857 Here must have been *where the old pavilion was* | Hardy L78 Is that *where the gentleman lives?*—Here we must place the frequent combinations with *this is* (*that was*): this is *where we saw him last* | this is *why he never laughs* | that was *how he always did it*, etc.

**3.7₃.** Relative clauses of this kind are not frequent as objects of verbs. I take the following two cases to be undoubtedly relative: AV Matth 8.20 the sonne of man hath not *Where to lay his head* (parallel to the objects in the preceding *haue holes*, *haue nests*), cf 1.1₈ | Mi Co 760 I hate *when vice can bolt her arguments.* I also think we have relative rather than interrogative clauses in Kipl K 189 I have not forgotten *when he sent me back for a cigar-case* | Wells TM 56 I determined to descend and find *where I could sleep* (i. e. a place where). But dependent interrogative clauses are much more frequent with *when* and *where*: I don't know *when he left*, and *where he has gone to* | I want to find out *where he slept*, etc., cf 3.8₆.

**3.7₄.** But as objects of preposition such relative clauses are frequent, though they do not seem to be very old in the language:

Defoe R 2.112 they came so near *where the thickest of them lay* | ib 2.64 to stay close within *where they were* | Kipl J 2.201 from *where K. and the girl were*, the confusion looked . . . | id S 283 it's three hundred miles from Fort Everett to *where I picked 'em up* | HopesD 45 her victoria happened to stop opposite *where I was eated in the park* |

Walpole OL 174 I'll write to you from *where I'm going* | Galsw D 83 look, under *where the cave hangs out* | Benson A 17 walk straight off into the direction of *where the moon is just going to rise.*

With preposition before and in the clause: Hardy R 347 He looked to *where the sound came from.*

By Ch IV.13 Venice . . . Sinks, like a seeweed, into *whence she rose* | Sher 343 I could not turn my eyes from *whence the danger came* [= from the place from which].

Ru P 2.179 homewards, from *wherever we had got to.*

GE S 135 you always did from *when first you begun to walk* | Elizabeth F 197 I knew it within a week of *when it happened* | Gissing NP '96 certain families were away at the seaside; by *when they returned* she would have outlived this acute misery | Bennett LR 110 it's a dodge I instituted in our hotels *for when we were expecting the great* | Lewis MA 271 Say, have you picked your secretary yet, *for when you get to Congress*? | Galsw SS 249 he's changed a good deal *from when I used to know him* | Bennett ECh 77 I began to feel queer. But that was nothing to *when the chaplain started to say the burial service* | Galsw D 91 that horrid feeling of *when one has not been kind.*—Cp also Sh Tw III 2.18 they haue beene grand iurie men, since *before Noah was a saylor* | Galsw SS 119 you've had no interest in Danby & Winter's since *before you were elected* — where a temporal conjunction clause is treated in the same way.

## Resumption.

**3.7₅.** A relative clause primary may be resumed later by a personal or demonstrative pronoun, especially if the sentence is somewhat long or if the exact continuation has not been clear to the mind of the speaker or writer from the very first beginning:

Ch G 288 *Who so that troweth nat this*, a beste *he* is | Sh Ant I.2.102 *Who tels me true*, though in his tale lye death, I heare *him* as he flatter'd | AV Matth. 5.39 *whosoeuer shall*

*smite thee on thy right cheeke*, turne to *him* the other also . . . And *whosoeuer shall compell thee to goe a mile*, go with *him* twaine | Acts 8.19 Giue me also this power, that *on whomsoeuer I lay hands*, *hee* may receiue the holy Ghost | Sh R 2 I 1.87 Looke *what I said*, my life shall proue *it* true | Macb I 5.21 *What thou wouldst highly*, *that* wouldst thou holily | Hml I 2.249 And *whatsoeuer els shall hap to night*, Giue *it* an vnderstanding but no tongue | Swift 3.278 I should signify my request; and *whatever it were*, *it* should be gratified | Gissing R 157 it might be said that *whatever folly is possible* to a moneyless man, *that folly* I have at some time or another committed.

In some of these sentences, the clause is hardly to be distinguished from clause subjuncts with *whoever* or *whatever* (see vol. IV). But otherwise this phenomenon is identical with the resumption found so often in colloquial and vulgar speech, when some word or word-group is placed first in a kind of extraposition and afterwards resumed, as in: the old doctor at the hospital, *he* said . . . | to take such things seriously, *that* is what I should never do | Sh Lr II 1.124 Our father *he* hath writ | Tw V 1.401 For the raine *it* raineth euery day, etc. It is therefore absurd to call *he*, *him*, *that* in such sentences the "antecedent" of the relative, as Sonnenschein does.

**3.7₆.** We have the inverted order with preparatory *it*: Maxwell EG 356 because *it* is wrong *what you are doing* | Kaye Smith GA 143 he wondered if *it* was true *what Mabel had said*. *It* cannot be called the antecedent of *what* (note that it is impossible to say "it what she said was true"), but the whole is analogous to frequent combinations like: *it* is wrong *to lie* (1.3₅) | *it* was splendid *that you were able to come* | *it* is strange *the number of mistakes he makes* | *it* is getting on my nerves, *this business* etc.

### Relative or Interrogative.

**3.8₁.** It may sometimes be difficult to decide whether a pronoun (and a clause) is relative or interrogative—it

must be remembered that the relative pronouns *who*, *which*, *what* and the corresponding adverbs were interrogative before they became relative as well. Grammarians are not always clear on this point; even Sweet's treatment of the difficulty is not satisfactory, for the class of "conjunctive pronouns" which he sets up, evidently as a kind of intermediary between relative and interrogative, does not help us at all. It is often said that *what* is relative if it is possible to substitute *that which*, but that rule does not assist us with regard to the other pronouns and adverbs. Curme (CG 10) treats as "indefinite and general relative pronouns" a great many pronouns which to my mind are undoubtedly interrogative, e. g. I do not know *who did it* | I did not see *whom he struck* | I did not see *to whom he gave it* | As I have not yet read all the new books, I cannot tell you *which I like best.* E. A. Kock (Engl. Rel. Pron., Lund 1897, 58) has some very good remarks on the distinction. As he says, doubt is only possible when the clause is dependent on some word involving narration, utterance, perception, remembrance, knowledge, while the clause is always interrogative after a word involving question, doubt, uncertainty, curiosity.

**3.8₂.** Let us now take some examples and, in analyzing them, try to find out some criteria which may help us to know whether we have a relative clause or a dependent question.

In Curme's last sentence the use of *which* seems decisive, for it is used in the distinctive sense peculiar to the interrogative pronoun and foreign to the relative (cf however, 3.5₆): therefore it would be possible to use it here in speaking of persons: As I do not know all the new boys, I cannot tell you *which of them I like best.* As Curme himself notices, it would be possible in his sentence to add *one* or *ones* to *which*: but the relative *which* cannot be thus modified.

"I did not see *whom he struck*": if this meant the same thing as "I did not see the man he struck" it would be a relative, but in that sense it is unidiomatic. It would be impossible to say, for instance "I did not meet *whom he loves*". Therefore,

we have the interrogative pronoun even in Farnol A 294 he has chosen *whom his ward must marry*—though the verb *choose* would seem at the first blush not to be among those requiring a dependent question. Similarly *settle*, *decide*, etc. There may be some doubt in some poetical passages, like Browning 1.264 You watch *who crosses and gossips*, *who saunters*, *who hurries by*. In prose it would certainly have been a dependent question, but Browning may have meant it as an imitation of the old relative construction and as signifying "you watch those who . . .".

**3.8₃.** "I insist on knowing *who planned this crime*": interrogative, for if you had not heard exactly what was said you would ask the speaker, "*What* do you insist on knowing", not, "*Whom* do you insist on knowing?" The sentence is not equivalent to "I insist on making the acquaintance of the man who planned this crime". Note also that in the sentence just quoted the relative *who* is always weakly stressed, while the pronoun in a dependent question may have strong stress and nucleus-tone. However, an accentual difference is not always made between "I insist on knowing *what it has cost*" and "I insist on paying *what it has cost*". In the latter sentence we have a relative clause.

**3.8₄.** The difference is more pronounced between "Those journalists don't mind what they print" (i. e. they will print anything) and "I don't mind what they print in the newspapers" (i. e. I don't mind the things they print); in the former, *what* (interr.) is strongly stressed with high tone; in the second, *what* (rel.) is weakly stressed; the strongest stress and highest tone is on *I* and *newspapers*.

After *remember* we may also have now a relative and now an interrogative clause, but usually the stress is decisive, e. g. in "I don't remember what he said".

**3.8₅.** In the following quotations we have first an interrogative and then a relative clause: Sh Alls IV 1.48 Is it possible he should know *what hee is*, and be *that he is*? (*that* as in 3.7₁) | Bennett PL 179 She had shown *what she was made of*, and *what she was made of* was unquestionably marvellous |

Trollope Aut 222 the reader, without labour, knows *what he means*, and knows *all that he means.* — In Fowler KE p. 101, Macaulay is justly blamed for writing, "*What sums he made* can only be conjectured, but must have been enormous": the same clause is made to serve first as interrogative and then as relative.

**3.8₆.** Similarly clauses beginning with *when* and *where* may be either interrogative or relative: in the latter case they are generally subjuncts (cf. 3.7₃ on the rare cases in which they are objects). Note the difference between the interrogative "I didn't see *where she sat*" and the relative "I didn't see her *where she sat*": in the former, but not in the latter case *where* may be strongly stressed. In the same way with *when.* If your friend is out and you ask when he will be in, the servant may say either: "He didn't tell me *when he would be back*" or "He didn't tell me *when he went out*"—or even combine the two: "When he went out, he didn't tell me when he would be back".

In Stevenson T 45 "I ran up the avenue to where the white line of the Hall buildings looked on either hand on great old gardens" we have a relative, but ib 48 an interrogative clause: "I have here some clue to where Flint buried his treasure". Cp also Macaulay H 1.115 Cromwell discerned, with the keen glance of genius, what Essex and men like Essex were unable to perceive (rel). He saw precisely where the strength of the Royalists lay (interr.).

**3.8₇.** Very often an inserted *just*, *precisely*, or *exactly* serves to show that the idea is interrogative and not relative: Galsw T 187 *What exactly* Paganism was we shall never know; what exactly Christianism is, we are as little likely to discover | Bennett W 2.107 Laurence had left the flat—under *exactly what* circumstances Sophia knew not | Russell Anal. of Mind 11 as soon as we try to say *what exactly* the difference is, we become involved in perplexities | Norris S 190 How it happened, *just who* made the first move, in *precisely what* manner the action had been planned, Wilbur could not afterwards satisfactorily explain.

This is particularly useful in sentences beginning with *when*, which might otherwise be taken as the equivalent of G *wenn* (not *wann*), cp the use of *whether* (not *if*) in 2.44: *Just when* he came we could not say | Pearsall Smith Words 114 *When precisely* the phenomena of music began to exert an influence . . . I am not learned enough to say.

**3.8s.** As interrogative and relative clauses are thus related, we should not wonder, perhaps, that a relative construction is often used where strict logic would seem to require an interrogative clause. This is found chiefly, but not exclusively, in colloquial style. Both constructions are combined in Doyle (NP '95) "showing you what kind of men they were, and the sort of warfare that they waged" (= and what sort of w. they waged).

Examples of relatives: Shelley 369 What is Freedom? —ye can tell *That which slavery is*, too well | Gissing H 210 Remember *the father I was* | Doyle Sh 5.136 She broke away from your influence when she found *the man that you are* [= what kind of man] | Locke G P 258 now I've confessed *the mad fool I've been here* | Bennett W 2.173 you'd scarcely believe *the wages they get* | Lewis MA 214 it'd surprise you *the effect it's had* on careless housewives.

After a preposition: Mary Shelley F 50 I grew alarmed *at the wreck I perceived that I had become* | Di Do 286 I don't think it possible to form an idea *of the angel Miss Dombey was this afternoon* | Masefield W 50 There she reflected *on the fool she'd been* (in the same way London M 19) | Walpole F 318 the remembrance *of the good friend that she had been to him for so many years* overwhelmed Peter | Phillpotts K 101 she hadn't the smallest idea *of the man he was, or the life he led.* No preposition is put in: Kipl L 224 (vg) you've no idea, sir, *the amount of little things that these chambers uses up* | Ferber S 10 you've no idea *the things that happen to you* if you just relax.

It is quite natural that most of the examples I have noted of this construction should contain the words *sort*, *kind*, or *manner*. I print only a few of them.

Collins W 323 when I had seen for myself *the sort of woman Miss Halcombe was* | Wells Ma 1.93 with swift capable touches she indicated *the sort of life the future Mrs. Maynes might enjoy* | Walpole DW 411 I had no idea of *the kind of person Roddy was* | Dreiser F 325 they wished to see *the kind of wife he had* | Kaye Smith HA 234 forgetting *the manner of woman she was.*—Note both constructions in Walp Cp 6 she wondered *what* there was for dinner and *the kind of mood* that her father would be in.

Relative instead of dependent interrogative is the rule in French with the neuter: Je tiens à savoir *ce qu'il a fait;* cp on the other hand: Je tiens à savoir *qui l'a fait.* Other cases in French, see Sandfeld Jensen, Bisætningerne, p 33. In Spanish: Galdós P 154 Pepe no sabía *lo que le mortificaba más,* si la severidad de su tía ó las hipócritas condescencias del canónigo | ib. 208 Yo sé *lo que hago* y por qué lo hago.—Therefore we have the relative in French repeated questions (= you ask what . . .): Molière Méd. malgré lui II 4 Que croyez vous qu'il faille faire? *Ce que ie croy* qu'il faille faire?

---

## Chapter IV.

## Relative Clause Adjuncts.

**4.11.** In vol. II we have seen various kinds of adjuncts: adjectives, substantives, pronouns, also word-groups like infinitives with *to*, etc. Here we shall deal with clauses as adjuncts. The only clauses employed thus are the so-called relative clauses, and on the other hand the chief use of relative clauses is that of serving as adjuncts, though some are used as primaries (see ch. III) and others as subjuncts (see vol. IV).

In ordinary combinations like:

a man *who knows nothing*
the facts *we mentioned above*
the room *where* (*in which*) *he slept*, etc. —

the relative clause is an adjunct, as can often be shown by the possibility of substituting an ordinary adjective-adjunct,

as *an ignorant man* and *the above-mentioned facts* for the first two examples; but this is no certain criterion, and the clause is an adjunct in those cases as well, in which no such substitution is possible, as in the third example above. The primary to which the relative clause is made an adjunct is generally called the *antecedent.*

**4.12.** It is a natural consequence of the adjunct nature of the relative clause that there is a tendency in many languages to use *and* before a clause if the primary has another adjunct. This is the regular idiom in French, but is generally looked upon as a fault when it occurs in English, see, for instance, Krapp, *Mod. Engl.* 317. It is, however, frequently heard in colloquial English, and is by no means rare in literature, though probably not so much used now as in the 18th c. Examples:

Defoe G 30 doing the foulest and blackest things and which we say are below a gentleman (very frequent in Defoe) | Swift 3.76 mercy, the most commendable virtue in a prince, and for which his Majesty was so justly celebrated | Fielding 3.503 he beheld a sail at a very little distance, and which luckily seemed to be making towards him | ib 5.432 the sign of the Bell, an excellent house indeed, and which I do most seriously recommend | Richardson G 52 Miss Barnevelt, a lady of masculine features, and whose mind belied not those features | Wordsw P 9.215 born in a poor district, and which yet Retaineth more of ancient homeliness | Scott O 19 a young man of low rank, heavily built, and who kept his face muffled | Byron D J 1.65 A man well looking for his years, and who Was neither much beloved, nor yet abhorr'd | Shelley L 588 I take this rather as an unkind piece of kindness in you; but which . . . I forgive | ib 825 a great and serious evil to me, and which . . . .

Cp also Defoe M 87 We had an indifferent good voyage till we came just upon the coast of England, *and where* we arrived in two-and-thirty days | De Quincey 162 Lord Desart, whose good-nature was unbounded, *and which,* in regard to myself, had been measured rather by . . . (which =good nature). Such loose relative constructions are, of course, generally avoided in literature.

**4.2₁.** The antecedent may be a substantive (*the man* who sits there), an adjective primary (II ch. XI: *the poor*, who always deserve our pity), a pronoun primary (*we*, who have always been your friends | *all* that ends well), or an isolated genitive in the cases mentioned 1.4₂ (*Mr. Lorry's* which . ., i. e. his house).

**4.2₂.** If a relative clause is added to a genitive with its primary, it may sometimes be doubtful which word it refers to, and therefore an *of*-phrase is preferred: "I know the father of the boy whom you mentioned" rather than "the boy's father whom". Ch A 781 by *my fader* soule that is deed | Sh Lr I 4.111 for taking *ones* part that is out of fauour | Hml V 1.85 *Caines* jaw-bone, that did the first murther—in all these cases *of* would have been clearer. Sometimes the choice of the pronoun shows conclusively which word the relative refers to: Sh Cæs V 1.83 eagles . . . feeding from *our soldiers* hands, Who to Philippi heere consorted vs | Goldsm (q) Do you refuse *this lady's* hand whom I now offer you. (Further quotations and references Poutsma II 965.)

**4.2₃.** Somewhat more often the antecedent is the personal pronoun contained in a possessive (see Sohrauer, Kleine beitr. zur altengl. gramm. 27, Abbott § 218):

Ch C 138 for *his* love that deyde vpon a tree | Marl T 225 this face Must grace *his* bed that conquers Asia | Sh Tp III 1.77 At *mine* unworthiness that dare not offer What I desire to give | id Cor III 2.119 | Beaumont 254 Stand at *his* door that hates you | Mi S A 377 *my* folly, who have profaned The mystery of God | ib 1000 *my* folly, who committed | ib 439 delivered them out of *thine* [thy hands], who slew'st them many a slain | id PL 1.161 *His* high will whom we resist | ib 5.179 *His* praise, who out of darkness call'd up light | Goldsm 674 Though my family be as good as *hers* you came down to visit | By DJ 5.59 *Their* names who rear'd it | Mary Shelley F 241 I have grasped to death *his* throat who never injured me | Thack P 2.173 *his* letters who was her lover yesterday | GE M 2.339 *his* hopes, whom she loved,

and who loved her | Tenn 388 Rash were *my* judgment then, who . . . | Wilde In 117 in *his* soul who wrought it.

**4.2₄.** Adjective predicatives (felt as neuter) may be antecedents, see 6.4₅. On verbal ideas (unexpressed infinitives) as antecedents see 6.4₆f. Cp also the mental parentheses mentioned in 5.7.

## Preliminary Survey.

**4.3₁.** In OE relative clauses were introduced by demonstrative pronouns (m. *se*, f. *seo*, n. *þæt*) or by the "relative particle" *þe* or by both jointly (5.6₂). *De* disappeared in the ME period, and *that*, which represents OE *þæt* or perhaps to some extent *þæt-þe*, *þætte*, became the ordinary relative word (pronoun or conjunction ? see ch VIII). How this came to be used after masculine and feminine antecedents and after plurals, has never been completely elucidated; early examples see E. A. Kock, *The Engl. Rel. Pronouns*, Lund 1897, p. 30f. and Wülfing 1.407. In ME the interrogative pronouns *who*, *whom* and *which* came into use as relative pronouns; *whom* was used as such earlier than the nom. *who*, and the use in clause-primaries (see ch. III) is found somewhat earlier than as an ordinary relative (in clause-adjuncts). The modern distinction between *who* (referring to human beings) and *which* (referring to things) was only gradually developed (see ch. VI). In early Modern English *that* is the favourite relative and is found in non-restrictive as well as in restrictive clauses, but there is in literature a growing tendency to extend the sphere of the *wh*-words, which more and more oust *that* from non-restrictive clauses. *Who* and *which* reminded scholars of the Latin pronouns and came to be looked upon as more refined or dignified than the more popular *that*.

**4.3₂.** The literary predilection for the *wh*-pronouns is most characteristically displayed in Addison's well-known 'Humble Petition of Who and Which' (*The Spectator*, No.78,

30 May, 1711), in which with total disregard of historical truth he makes these two pronouns complain of the injury done to them by the recent extension of the use of *that*. 'We are descended of ancient families, and kept up our dignity and honour many years till the jacksprat *that* supplanted us.' It is true that a following number of *The Spectator* contained an apologetic reply from *That*, but this was evidently meant as irony, as when *that* urges that it can be repeated 'with great eloquence' in the same sentence, as for instance in the words of a great orator, 'My Lords! with humble submission, *That that* I say is this: *that that that that* gentleman has advanced, is not *that*, *that* he should have proved to your Lordships'. (This really looks worse than it sounds, on account of the different stress and vowel of the two *thats*.) In accordance with his own theory, Addison, when editing *The Spectator* in book-form, corrected many a natural *that* into a less natural *which* or *who*.

By the side of clauses with *that*, *who*, and *which* we have from early times relative clauses without any connective word—*contact-clauses* as we may term them—, which have always been very frequent in colloquial English, but which were also persecuted by scholars: in deference to Latin syntax Dryden, for instance, in the later editions of his Essay on Dramatic Poesy changed such phrases as "I cannot think so contemptibly of the age I live in" to "the age in which I live".

**4.3s.** From a formal point of view we must therefore in Present English distinguish the following three chief classes of relative clauses, namely:

(1) contact-clauses without any connective,
(2) clauses with *that*, and
(3) clauses with *who* or *which*.

By the side of these we have clauses with the pronominal adverbs *when*, *where*, etc., with *as* and with *but*, but these we shall leave out for the present.

**4.34.** There is another very important division of relative clauses, namely into

(A) Restrictive or defining clauses, which give a necessary determination to the antecedent, and thereby make it more precise, and

(B) Non-restrictive or loose clauses, which might be discarded without serious injury to the precise understanding of the sentence as a whole.

A subdivision under (B) is formed by continuative clauses, in which *who* and *which* might be replaced by *and he*, *and she*, *and it*, or *and they*.

The distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive is the same that is found with other adjuncts (see PG 108ff.): *beautiful* is restrictive in 'a beautiful view', but not in Browning's 'Beautiful Evelyn Hope is dead', *poor* is restrictive in 'poor relations' when contrasted with 'rich relations', but not in a father's fondling exclamation 'My poor little girl!'.

The bi-partition here adopted cannot always be strictly carried through; still it is more satisfactory than the tripartition sometimes proposed.

There is no exact correspondence between the formal classification and the logical distinction between restrictive and loose relative clauses: the first class (1) is used exclusively and the second (2) chiefly in restrictive clauses (A), while the third class (3) may be used both in restrictive and in loose clauses (A and B). The historical tendency is, in literary style, to favour the *wh*-clauses at the expense of the two other classes, but the position of the latter is still very strong in popular usage.

While there is never a pause before a contact-clause, and while a pause is comparatively rare before the relative *that*, it is frequent before non-restrictive *who* and *which*, often accompanied by an appreciable lowering of the tone before it, which serves to show that the sense is complete in itself

without the addition of the clause: this of course applies especially to continuative clauses. Another formal trait is that a preposition in the first two formal classes has to be placed after the verb, while it may precede the *wh*-pronouns (see ch. X). In writing, a comma is nearly always placed before a non-restrictive, but very rarely before a restrictive relative clause.

**4.3s.** To find out the actual usage in the nineteenth century I have classified the first hundred relative clauses in the following passages from writers representative of different styles, to which I have added extracts from Henry Sweet's *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch*, which are typical of colloquial as distinct from literary English. The great diversity found is easily accounted for from the whole tenor of the passages and the idiosyncracies of the writers.

Shelley, *Prometheus Unbound*, from the beginning.
Tennyson, *Maud*, from the beginning.
Carlyle *The French Revolution*, II, Book V, ch. vi ff.
Macaulay, *Essay on Addison*, from the beginning.
Huxley, *Essay on Liberal Education*, beginning p. 58 (Suppose it were . . .).
Stevenson, *Treasure Island*, ch. iv ff.
Hope, *Dolly Dialogues*, from the beginning.
Sweet, *Elementarbuch*, Nos. 1—24, 53—73, supplemented by *Primer of spoken English*, pp. 68ff.

Doubtful cases have here been distributed according to my best judgment, and they include not a few clauses which were neither definitely restrictive nor quite 'loose'. Clauses with *whose*, *that*, or no pronoun have been divided into two classes ("person" and "thing"), but as Shelley often personifies mountains, etc., some of his examples should, perhaps have been placed under "person" instead of "thing". The numbers are as follows:

| | Restrictive. | Loose. | Continuative. | who (whom). | whose, person. | whose, thing. | which. | that, person. | that, thing. | no pronoun, person. | no pronoun, thing. | what. | -ever (whoever, whatever). | where (wherein, etc). | as. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shelley | 75 | 25 | 0 | 31 | 5 | 3 | 32 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Tennyson | 77 | 23 | 0 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 39 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Carlyle | 52 | 26 | 22 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 40 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Macaulay | 88 | 10 | 2 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Huxley | 89 | 11 | 0 | 26 | 9 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Stevenson | 74 | 25 | 1 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 20 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 2 |
| Hope | 92 | 7 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 26 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Sweet | 90 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 16 | 5 | 35 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 1 |
| | 637 | 136 | 27 | 182 | 24 | 3 | 212 | 25 | 100 | 20 | 84 | 86 | 4 | 46 | 14 |
| | | 163 | | | 27 | | | 125 | | 104 | | | | | |

It is interesting to note the difference in the number of restrictive clauses. Carlyle here has the lowest number, 52 per cent. This is very characteristic of his style with its strong emotional colouring; and a comparison of his use of adjectives with that found, for instance, in Macaulay would no doubt show the same predilection for descriptive and emotional as against purely defining adjectives. He also has the greatest number of continuative relative clauses, being very fond of connecting sentences by means of 'In which case', 'To all which our poor Legislative . . . can oppose nothing', 'Who' after a full stop, etc.

*Which* evidently is avoided by Tennyson and Stevenson in accordance with everyday speech, as is shown in the figure given from Sweet; on the other hand, the figure for *which* from Hope is surprisingly high. Tennyson's predilection for *that* (48, Stevenson 27, all the others below 20) may be due to his well-known prejudice against sibilants for

reasons of euphony; Odell (1806) already called attention to such lines from Pope and Gray as the following:

> The wand'ring streams *that* shine between the hills.
> Colours *that* change whene'er they wave their wings.
> Thin trees arise, *that* shun each other's shades.
> And many a holy text around she strews,
> *That* teach the rustic moralist to die

where the sound would be spoilt if we substituted *which* for *that.*

Tennyson even uses non-restrictive *that*, e. g. 301 *From the lake to the meadow and on to the wood, Our wood, that is dearer than all* | 306 *Is it kind to have made me a grave so rough? Me, that was never a quiet sleeper?*

On the other hand, Macaulay avoids not only contact clauses but also *that*; in the passage examined there is only one instance of relative *that*, viz. p. 77, 'the worst book on Greek history that ever was printed', where I imagine the reason to be that the combination *which ever* might be misunderstood as *whichever.*

### Restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

**4.41.** We shall now consider the distinction between the two classes A and B in detail and first give some examples taken, though somewhat modified, from Bain and Hodgson:

(A) All the soldiers that were brave pushed on.
(B) The soldiers, who were all of them brave, pushed on.
(A) I met the boatman that had taken me across the ferry.
(B) I met the boatman, who then took me across the ferry.
(A) He had four sons that became lawyers.
(B) He had four sons, who became lawyers.

In (A) we may expect some continuation like "and two that became clergymen"; but even then many writers would here prefer *who*; in (B) we may insert "all of them".

(A) There were very few passengers that escaped without serious injury.

(B) There were very few passengers, who escaped without serious injury.

**4.42.** After these made-up sentences I shall give some quotations from various authors in which the two classes are found together; but of course in literature we cannot expect to come across examples that form such clear contrasts as those just given.

Sh Lr V 3.214 Told the most pitious tale of Lear and him, *That* euer eare receiued, *which* in recounting His griefe grew puissant | Mcb 1 4.4 I haue spoke With one *that* saw him die, *who* did report, That very frankly hee confess'd his Treasons | As III 4.51 you have oft enquired after the shepherd *that* complained of love, *who* you saw sitting by me on the turf | H4B I 3.58 like one, *that* drawes the model of a house Beyond his power to builde it; *who* (halfe through), giues o're | H5 IV 1.152 it will be a black matter for the King, *that* led them to it; *who* to disobey, were against all proportion of subiection | Bacon Atl. 28.3 the Tirsan; *who* presently delivereth it over to that sonne, *that* hee had formerly chosen to bee in house with him; *who* beareth it before his father | ib 28.17 the room hath tables on the sides for the ghests *that* are bidden; *who* are served with great and comely order | AV John I 9 the true light, *which* lighteth every man *that* commeth into the world | Lang T 4 Scott, *who* when a boy did little *that* would attract notice | Norris O 145 A question *that* he must ask, *which* involved the thing *that* was scarcely to be thought of, occurred to him | Wilde S 187 it comes from that monstrous and ignorant thing *that* is called Public Opinion, *which* is infamous and of evil meaning when it tries to control Thought or Art | NP '17 there is one point *that* I would like to make *which* will, I think, interest the House | NP '17 they divide women into two classes: those they want to kiss, and those they want to kick, *who* are all those they don't want to kiss.

**4.43.** In some quotations showing two different relatives in close juxtaposition, it seems impossible to find other motives than the desire to avoid monotony; thus in:

Goldsmith 617 an affair *which* my son here comes to open, *that* nearly concerns your happiness | Mary Shelley F 219 By the sacred earth on *which* I kneel, by the shades that wander near me, by the deep and eternal grief *that* I feel, I swear; and by thee, O Night, and the spirits *that* preside over thee, to pursue the dæmon *who* caused this misery until he or I shall perish in mortal conflict | Kingsley H 330 What science have you *that* you have not stolen from the Egyptians and Chaldees? And what had the Egyptians *which* Moses did not teach them? And what have the Chaldees *which* Daniel did not teach them? | NP '05 In free States everything is permitted *that* is not expressly forbidden. In Russia everything is forbidden *which* is not expressly authorised.

**4.51.** We may speak of *double restriction*, if two relative clauses are only seemingly coordinated, while really the second restricts the antecedent as already defined by the first: here the practice of writers varies considerably with regard to the relative words employed:

Sh Mcb V 1.59 I haue knowne those *which* haue walkt in their sleep *who* haue dyed holily in their beds | Scott Iv 166 they had swept the country of all *that* could be collected *which* was esteemed fit for their master's table | Carlyle H 127 How seldom do we find a man *that* has stirred up some vast commotion, *who* does not himself perish, swept away in it! | Allen S 117 can you mention any one *that* we know *who* is [as talented as he]? | Carpenter C 110 there are few *who* have thought about the matter *who* would be inclined to say . . . | Roberts M 126 there was very little *that* I wrote, up to the time of his leaving London permanently, *which* I did not discuss with him.

**4.52.** Double restriction with contact in the first clause: (Ch C 140, Sh As II 3.39) | Di Do 329 is there anything you want *that* you have not? | Yonge Kings of Engl. 125 they

murdered all they met *whom* they supposed to be gentlemen | MacCarthy 2.289 to tell English people of something they ought to do *which* they were not doing | James S 68 They're all I have *that* belonged to her | Wilde D 56 the only artists I have ever known *who* are personally delightful are bad artists | James RH 379 There isn't a harm this place can do us, or has done us, *that* hasn't had something in it we shall ache for again in some better one | Maxwell EG 355 as a punishment for every craving I felt *that* wasn't pure.

A contact-clause is naturally excluded in the second place.

**4.53.** Double restriction is particularly frequent after a negative expression—indeed some of the examples already given contain an 'indirect negation': Wordsw. P 3.190 there's not a man *That* lives *who* has not known his god-like hours | Di D 257 there is no one *that* I know of, *who* deserves to love you | Ruskin T 137 There is not one *who* knew him, I believe, *that* will not give cheerfully | ib 143 there is no man, whatever his fortune, *who* is now engaged in any earnest offices . . . *who* will not bear me witness | Thurston A 186 There was nothing in life *which* Dorothy might ask him then to do *which* he could not have accomplished | Holmes A 45 There is nothing in the shape of kindness *that* can make life beautiful, *which* has not found its home in that ocean principality | Doyle S 1.157 there was nothing *which* you could do *which* I had not already done | Fowler P 97 In fact there was nothing *which* really mattered *that* Jack could not do | O'Brien Russell 91 I believe there are few in England *who* know me at all *who* do not know me as an Irish Catholic.

With a contact-clause: Parker R 222 there was nothing he might ask of P. *which* he would not do.

**4.61.** We next proceed to various subclasses of restrictive clauses and shall first mention those introduced by *it is*: they are interesting from a logical point of view because it is not really the antecedent (or what looks like the antecedent) that is restricted by a relative clause. When we say "it is the wife that decides" or "it was the Colonel I was looking for" what we mean is really "the wife is the deci-

ding person" and "the Colonel was the man I was looking for": the relative clause thus might be said to belong rather to "it" than to the predicative following after "it is". "It is champagne I like best" means "champagne is what I like best". "It is only the milk that is bad" means "the only thing that is bad is the milk". (Cp G. Es war eine große neigung, *was* sie zusammenführte.)

This explains the possibility in such sentences of having a *that*-clause or a contact-clause after a word which is in itself so definite that it cannot be further restricted: It was the battle of Waterloo that decided the fate of Europe | it is this that counts | Carlyle FR 500 it is you now that must either do or die | Shaw Ms 27 it's they that have put the job up. It's we that run the country for them. It is possible to say "It is this spirit he would infuse into the nation", but a relative pronoun is indispensable in "we praised this spirit which he would infuse into the nation".

**4.62.** We now also see the logical connexion in some proverbial sentences, which analyzed differently will give no sense: It is a poor heart that never rejoices | it is an ill bird that fouls its own nest | it is a long lane that has no turning | it is a wise child that knows his own father (wittily used by Shakespeare in the Launcelot Gobbo scene, and by Shaw in "You never can Tell", act I) | Sh Merch I 2.15 it is a good diuine that followes his owne instructions | Buchan 39 Steps 123 It's a wise conspirator that knows his own name. The meaning obviously is "the heart that never rejoices is poor", etc.

*That* is used in all these examples, but I find *who* in Maugham Th 243 It would be a brave man who tried to stand up against Mr. Davidson.

**4.63.** Rosalind (in Sh As III 2.411) asks "Are you he that hangs the verses on the trees?" and that is the best logical way of saying this, but the most idiomatic way is by beginning with "Is it you". Chaucer has two different ways in A 1734 "That I am thilke woful Palamon That hath thy prison broken wikkedly", and a few lines later, "it am I

That loveth so hote Emelye the brighte". The latter phrase "it am I" through the literary "it is I" has now become the colloquial "it is me", but what about the person of the verb in the relative clause? Chaucer has the third person, which agrees with the logical analysis given above, but most people will take the relative clause to define the pronoun and therefore write "It is you that (or, who) are guilty", and even in the negative: "It is not I who am guilty". This is also the French rule: "C'est vous qui l'avez fait, ce n'est pas moi qui suis le coupable".

Still it will be seen that the tendency to use the third person which is found in the following quotations from recent writers is not wholly unjustifiable: Shaw D 229 Is it you thats going to be married or is it Edith? (= are you, or is E. the person that is) | Bennett HL 81 it's you that's good | Galsw P 12.41 'Tisn't I that wants to spoil your home | Swinnerton Noct. 189 It's me that has to give it up | Walpole GM 439 It wasn't you who was going to marry Philip | Barrie TG 399 It is myself who is writing at last.

**4.64.** The absolutely restrictive character of the clauses after *it is* explains the natural preference for *that* or contact-clause; still *who* and *which* are very frequent (as in the two last quotations in the preceding paragraph), e. g. it was John who settled the matter | it is *the moon which* we see over there | Lang T 197 It is not everybody, however, who can thus dissociate himself | Thack N 62 it is not only *bachelors on whom* the young ladies confer their affections (=not only on bachelors that . . ., 8.66). Note the alternation between *who* (person) and *that* (thing) in James S 22 It was not *they who* made the conditions, it was *the conditions that* made them.

**4.65.** Examples of *is it* after an interrogative pronoun: Sh Mcb II 2.44 Who was it that thus cry'd? | Carlyle R 2.338 who was it that then made me laugh? | Henley B 77 remember who it is that asks it? | Di Do 356 What is it that you have to sell? | Doyle NP 95 I told them who it was that they had helped to rescue || id S 6.54 in learning who it was who

met him | Di Do 348 who was it who could win his wife as she had won his boy! Who was it who had shown him that new victory! | Masefield C 351 he had never guessed what it was in him which was beautiful to her.

On the occurrence of *that that* after *it is*, see 8.3₂.

**4.6₆.** After *it is* we find frequent examples of two combined relative clauses, which resemble the instances of double restriction mentioned in 4.5, but are different from them in so far as the second clause logically refers to *it*, while the first goes with the word immediately preceding it. In the second clause *that* is generally used:

Sh Meas V 401 It was the swift celeritie of his death, *which* I did think with slower foot came on, *That* brain'd my purpose | Mary Shelley F 18 I have endeavoured to discover what quality it was *which* he possesses *that* elevates him so immeasurably above any other person I ever knew | Austen M 310 it is he *who* sees and worships your merit the strongest, *who* loves you most devotedly, *that* has the best right to a return (the two *who*-clauses are parallel) | Seeley L 241 it is only those *who* study Greek very deeply *that* can be said to make this acquisition | Dickinson C 55 Yes, it is we *who* do not accept it *that* practise the Gospel of peace; it is you *who* accept it *that* trample it underfoot | id R 34 I hardly believe that it will be those *who* have the finest sense of religion *that* will be most inclined to resent my candour. Rather it is precisely they *who* will be the most willing to investigate the ground and nature of their belief [This example is interesting: *who* is used in the last sentence because there is here only one clause, and the use of *they* (not *those*) also goes to show that the clause defines *it*] | Benson D 2.251 It is only people *who* can't see at all, *that* see the other aspect of it | Ridge G 168 it was not the hen *who* cackled the most *that* laid the largest egg | Locke St 33 It is only women *who* live alone *that* can know what it is to yearn to have a man's strong arm || Lee Sh 170 but it is not the historical traditions *which* are connected with Falstaff *that* give him his perennial attraction | Fox 2.19 It is the fuss and bustle principle, *which*

must proclaim itself until it is hoarse, *that* wars against truth | Archer A 130 It is the very difficulties over *which* the croakers shake their heads *that* make the experiment interesting | Stev MB 166 it is *what* Thoreau clearly whispered *that* Whitman so uproariously bawls.

**4.67.** Examples of the exceptional use of *who* and *which* in the second clause: Stev M 200 It is we *who* sit at home with evil *who* remember | Wilde SM 144 It was the Abolitionists *who* set the torch alight, *who* began the whole thing | Dickinson C 16 it is precisely those trade relations, *which* it was thought would knit you in the bonds of peace, *which* have brought you within reasonable distance of a general war. — The following sentence would have been decidedly better if *that* had been substituted for the second *which*: Kingsley H 193 And what was it *which* Wulf had recognised in Hypatia *which* had bowed the old warrior before her? Another badly constructed sentence is Wells Bishop 202 it was Mary *who* went to her Lord simply, *who* was commended, and not Martha who troubled about many things.

**4.7.** In the interesting type of sentence consisting only of a predicative with a relative clause, which we shall describe in 17.8s, we never find *wh*-pronouns, always *that* or contact: Sheridan 209 A good, honest trade you're learning, Sir Peter! | Di N 440 The attention that I've shown to that man! The hyseters [vg = oysters] he has eat, and the pints of ale he has drank, in this house!

**4.8.** The rest of this chapter is devoted to clauses which are decidedly restrictive in character and are found after pronouns and other words which, in this connexion at any rate, are not definite enough in themselves. The quotations here collected serve to show the actual use of the various relative words in such clauses, and should be compared with those given in ch. VII of contact-clauses after the same words.

**4.81.** *All* (persons) Spect 470 attack all that are so unfortunate as to walk the streets | Wordsw P 5.186 in the heart of *all that* breathe | Tenn In Mem LX envying *all that* meet him there | Stev T 120 Of *all the beggar-men* I had seen

or fancied, he was the chief for raggedness || Swift 3.167 dashing out the brains of *all who* came near | Wordsw P 3.448 when *all who* dwelt within these famous walls Led . . . a studious life | Di Do 68 a comfort to *all who* knew her | Thack N 325 almost *all who* beheld his face felt kindly towards him | Stevenson MB 188 the arrest af *all who* were concerned.

Johnson (Letter in Bosw. 1.221) has first *all who* and then *all that* (can it be in the second place to avoid the acc. *whom?*): You may be told in a very few words, that all who knew you wish you well; and all that you embraced at your departure, will caress you at your return.

*All* (neuter): *All* is well *that* ends well | Sh Merch II 7.65 *All that* glisters is not gold | Stevenson D 1 *All* is not gold *that* glitters | Kingsley H 333 *All that* remained in either case was the test of experience | Doyle S 5.123 we have now exhausted *all that* his room can teach us | Butler Er 113 it was *all that* the two jailors could do to keep him on his legs || Fielding 3.607 could we record *all which* that good man delivered on these occasions | Lamb E 1.128 a touch of the eccentric in *all which* he does or says | Scott Iv 235 by *all which* I believe | Kingsley H 250 *All which* is worth settling you seemed to have settled for yourself. — This *all which* seems always rather 'bookish'. There is a different *all which* with *all* as adjunct to *which*, see 6.4₇.

**4.8₂.** *Every* and *any* with compounds: Di Do 9 was there *anybody* there *that* they thought would suit? || id D 257 *every one who* knows you, consults with you | ib 271 *every one who* likes me, has a claim on her | Shaw C 172 your profession frightens *every woman who* is not a fury.

The same in the neuter: Ru S 162 how can *anything that* we do be right—how can anything we think be wise? | Doyle S 5.99 You'll just ask me *anything that* I don't make clear || MacCarthy 2.361 they would have *anything which* could command a majority rather than nothing | Doyle S 6.141 we will report *anything which* may have happened in the interval.

**4.8₃.** *No* and compounds: Benson D 164 there was *no one who* was not glad || Di X 4 *no wind that* blew was bitterer

than he | Seeley: *no heart* is pure *that* is not passionate | Stevenson A 68 *nothing* should be done in a hurry *that* can be done slowly | Kipl in First Book 94 *nothing* can be wholly beautiful *that* is not useful | Shaw 2.110 *Nothing thats* worth saying is proper || Franklin 12 *nothing* was useful *which* was not honest | Doyle S 5.242 *No record* of the doings of Mr. Sh. H. would be complete *which* did not include it.

**4.84.** *Much, little, few:* his writings contain *little that* is new or startling, and *much that* is old and even trite | Scott Iv 24 I have introduced *little which* can be termed modern | Kingsley H 336 *the little time that* is left you | Huxley Crome Yellow 1 All the trains—*the few that* there were—stopped at all the stations.

**4.85.** We have restrictive clauses after interrogative pronouns; here *that* is generally preferred; *who* is naturally avoided after another *who* (where the two *who's* might be taken for a stammering repetition of the same word). Examples:

Fielding T 3.141 *Who that* has such a home to return to, would travel about the country like a vagabond? | Austen P 240 *Who that* knows what his misfortunes have been can help feeling an interest in him? | Mary Shelley F 70 *Who that* had seen him bright and joyous . . . but must weep | Wordsw P 8.40 And *who that* sees her would not buy? | Coleridge Sh 230 *Who, that* is competent to judge, doubts the result? | Hope R 224 *Who that* knows what man and woman are would not have shrunk from that alternative? | Hawthorne Sn 78 *who that* had not known the proof could believe him guilty?

Thus also often when *that* does not follow *who* immediately: Marlowe (Sh As III 5.82) *Who* euer lou'd *that* lou'd not at first sight?

Cf also under *it is* (4.6).

Sometimes, however, the less natural *who* is used: Thack N 306 *Whom* did he not benefit *whom* he knew not, and what eye that saw him did not bless him? | ib 332 as *who* would not *who* has read the Arabian Nights in his youth?

*That* after other interrogative pronouns: Thack N 327 *Which* of us *that* is thirty years old has not had his Pompeii? (note here the verbal form *is*; different from: *Which of us, who are* 30 . . . with stressed *us*) | id S 162 *what man* is there *that* has not some things in life to complain of? || Mary Shelley F 236 *What* can I say *that* will enable you to understand? | Di N 663 *What* can I say *that* will induce you to pause? | Henley B 17 *What* has been done *that* is either memorable or worthy? | James S 99 I'm afraid of what I'm doing.—Then *what, that's* so awful, are you doing?

Examples of *who* in such combinations: Mered F 110 *Which* of us *who* is of any worth is without the fantastical element? | Caine E 372 *What woman who* loves a man can break the idol in his heart?

Similarly *that* is used after *whatever*: Di D 87 *Whatever* I had within me *that* was romantic and dreamy, was encouraged.

**4.9₁.** Superlatives and similar words: Sh Wint IV 4.156 This is *the prettiest low-borne lass that* euer Ran on the greene-sord | Mids I 1.63 that I may know *The worst that* may befall me in this case | Sheridan 335 of all the women . . . she is *the last that* would triumph in my heart | Walpole DW 410 You're the *best friend that* he's got | Chesterton: *The most important thing that* happened in the Victorian time was that nothing happened | McKenna Sh 150 you're *the only one that* knows your own feelings | Brontë W 1 my landlord—the *solitary neighbour that* I shall be troubled with || Page J 2 I was *the only child* of my parents *who* survived.

The superlative may be placed in the clause: De Quincey 345 But the person, after all, *that* did *most* to serve our Kate, was Kate | Tennyson is the poet that he likes best.

**4.9₂.** After *the same, that* is very frequent, though many prefer *who* when referring to persons; in some examples *that* borders on the purely conjunctional use, see 8.6; *which* is not quite natural, but is affected by some writers who generally avoid *that.* On *as* after *the same* see 9.1₃: Sh Wiv IV 5.37 shee sayes, that the very same man *that* beguil'd

Master Slender of his chaine, cozen'd him of it | Lamb E 2.28 he is the same natural, easy creature on the stage, *that* he is off | Macaulay E 4.129 his commission is the same *that* on the Mountain of Ascension was given to the Eleven | Ru S 123 Give them [girls] the same advantages *that* you give their brothers | Hawth Sn 39 he was the same simple-hearted man that he had always been | Maugham TL 73 She was not quite certain that the Edward who wrote to her now was the same Edward *that* she had known | Maxwell EG 166 I'm just the same Elaine that you have always known | id F 162 she was exactly the same person that she had been at his first sight of her || Spect 388 the same man *who* drew the rest of the play | Defoe M 244 the same *who* I afterwards saw at Brickhill | Di Do 348 the same child at *whom* he had often glanced uneasily | Carlyle FR 471 This is the same brisk Narbonne, *who*, last year, cut out from their entanglement those poor Royal Aunts | Stevenson MB 186 the same *who* was afterwards assassinated || Spect 173 Oeconomy in our affairs has the same effect upon our fortunes *which* good breeding has upon our conversations | Gibbon M 9 my family arms are the same, *which* were borne by the Gibbons of Kent | Macaulay E 4.33 the race bore the same relation to other Asiatics *which* the Asiatics generally bear to the children of Europe | ib 139 the same relation *which* . . (thus frequently in Macaulay) | Doyle S 1.185 entangled in the same meshes *which* held me.

I have given so many quotations because the NED (under *same* 1) has none for *the same who*, and none for *the same that* referring to persons. In two of my quotations we have the predicative use (cf. 6.4a); in the one from Maugham, *that* may have been used in order to avoid the acc. *whom*. Cf. 9.1a.

## Chapter V.

## Relative Clauses Continued.

We shall here first deal with relative clauses after such words as admit both restrictive and non-restrictive clauses.

**5.11.** This is the case with personal and demonstrative pronouns. We have decidedly a restrictive clause if the sense is generic, i. e. if *he that*, &c., means 'anybody that, everybody that, all those that, whoever'.

"The combination *he that* is now obsolete in the spoken language, being preserved only in traditional phrases such as *he that fights and runs away may live to fight another day.* We now employ some such construction as *a man who* . . ., or, if absolutely necessary, *a man that.*" (Sweet NEG § 2140.)

Examples of this *he that*: Sh As III 2.25 hee that wants money, meanes, and content, is without three good frends | id Cymb V 4.178 he that sleepes, feeles not the tooth-ache | AV Prov 13.24 He that spareth his rod, hateth his sonne: but he that loueth him, chasteneth him betimes | Mark 4.9 he that hath eares to heare, let him heare | Swift PC 85 he that's born to be hang'd, will never be drowned.

*He . . . that:* here *he* has strong stress: Sh Ro II 2.1 he ieasts at scarres that neuer felt a wound | Marston (NED *glib*) He's a God that can doe villany With a good grace, and glib facility (cp with this: he's a man that you can trust —with weak *he*, the clause defining *a man*) | Sh As I 1.61 and he is thrice a villaine that saies such a father begot villaines | Swift PC 130 He was a bold man, that first eat an oyster.

**5.12.** *He who* (not frequent in colloquial speech): Shelley 234 'tis just: He who is evil can receive no good | Haggard She 29 He who would tamper with the secret forces that animate the world may well fall a victim to them.

*He . . . who* (somewhat more natural than *he who* close together): Defoe M 61 She is always married too soon who gets a bad husband, and she is never married too late who

gets a good one | Cowper L 2.240 Now let him believe the story who can | Coleridge 110 He prayeth well, who loveth well Both man and bird and beast | NP '20 and he would, indeed, be a bold man who imagined he could relieve his listener of all his doubts.—AV 2 Cor 10.18 For, not he that commendeth himselfe is approued, but *whom* the Lord commendeth: here *whom* seems to have been chosen, because it shows the case.

**5.13.** Examples of *they that* and *they . . . that* in the same sense (the identity of meaning in the singular and plural is shown by the variants quoted above 3.51):

Sh Merch I 2.5 they are as sicke that surfet with too much, as they that starue with nothing | Ro II 6.33 They are but beggers that can count their worth | Swift PC 174 there's none so blind as they that won't see | Defoe Pl 43 It was too true, though they that say so knew nothing of the matter | Bridges E 19 the last poor hope of them that fear | ib 161 Athena, mistress good of them that know.

**5.14.** We also find, though not so often, *they who* and *they . . . who*: Mi SA 264 they only liv'd who fled | ib 267 and lorded over them whom now they serve | ib 386 to them who had corrupted her | Dryden 5.206 let them who truly would appear my friends, Employ their swords, like mine, for noble ends | Wordsw 291 the simple plan That they should take, who have the power, And they should keep who can | Lang Tennyson 49 they are only the hopeless rhymers who bombard men of letters with their lyrics | ib 189 They who cannot forget Gordon must always be grateful to Tennyson.

In the older language we find *they which*: AV Luke 16.15 Ye are they which iustifie your selues before men (RV *they that*, 20th C. V. *the men who*) | Bacon (Bøgholm 48) incline unto them which are softest [but also: conquer them that resist].

**5.15.** *They*, and especially *them*, is now avoided in these combinations, and *those* is used instead. Shakespeare has both pronouns in Tw I 5.14 God giue them wisedome that

haue it: & those that are fooles, let them vse their talents. Cp a recent instance, Maugham TL 178 with the madness of those who love them that love them not.

*Those that:* Swift PC 142 those that eat black pudden will dream of the devil | Carlyle R 1.15 those that are called the uneducated classes.

*Those who:* Thack VF 305 those who are so bold, one might fancy they could face anything | MacCarthy 2.77 she was killed among those who resisted to the last.

Many writers would now use *those who* in speaking of persons, and *those that* in speaking of things (where *those which* is also possible, though not natural), see e. g. Swift 3.14 chains, like those that hang to a lady's watch | Russell Ed 124f. if the child is starved of pleasures he will cling tenaciously to those that are attainable . . . Those who hold that a lie is always wrong have to supplement this view by a great deal of casuistry | ib 96 Life is full of perils, but the wise man ignores those that are inevitable.

**5.1₆.** Next we come to cases of clauses after a non-generic *he, she, they.* It may perhaps be doubtful whether the clause is restrictive in Meredith H 477 in truth she sighed to feel as he did, above everybody!—she that had fallen so low | Henley and Stevenson Beau A 20 Where is she that was everything to John?

In Macaulay H 1.122 we have two instances of *he who*: in the first it is restrictive = the man that . . (the seeming leader), in the second *he* stands for Cromwell, and the clause is decidedly non-restrictive (note the comma): It seems probable that he who seemed to lead was really forced to follow . . . It would be absurd to suppose that he, who was never by his respectable enemies represented as wantonly cruel, would have taken the most important step of his life under the influence of mere malevolence.

Other examples of such strongly stressed and perfectly individualized pronouns before non-restrictive clauses: Beerbohm Seven Men 21 he gave in . . . He, who had never looked strong nor well, looked ghastly now | Williamson

Wedd. D. 118 Surely he, who understood, would come to her rescue now | Bennett OW 1.23 Constance . . . But she, who never felt these mad, amazing impulses, could nevertheless only smile fearfully | Lewis MA 249 Leora's demand that she, who had eternally his deepest love, should also demand his every fancy . . . He who had never been unctuous was profuse | Mackenzie RR 40 Mrs. Hector, Mrs. Eneas, and Mrs. Alexander . . what had Sholto's wife contributed to the family ascent? They, who had followed the example set by Miss Jukes, were surely entitled . . .

**5.17.** After words determined by the definite article or a genitive or possessive pronoun we may similarly have either restrictive or non-restrictive clauses. In some cases the word is completely individualized and admits no further restriction. "I met the old couple yesterday. The man, who took off his cap when he saw me, said nothing, but his wife at once began talking". Here *that* could not be substituted for *who*. But if we meet two men, one of whom greets me, I may say to my friend: "The man *that* (or, *who*) took off his cap was John Anderson". — "I had a letter and a post-card from him. The letter, which I received yesterday, contained nothing of interest, but the post-card was most important." But if the relative clause serves to show which of several letters is meant, both *that* and *which* may be used: "I'll show you the letter *that* (or, *which*) I received yesterday, but not the one I had this morning." Similarly with a possessive: *your letter* will in many, perhaps in most cases, be definite enough: "Your letter, which I received yesterday, was most welcome." On the other hand, if I write "your letter that I received yesterday was most welcome," I imply that this could not be said of some other letter or letters received at other times, but in that case it would be more natural to say: "The letter (that) I received from you yesterday."

Sometimes it is difficult to see why *that* has been chosen in preference to a non-restrictive *who* or *which*.

Note the hesitation between *that* and *which* in the parallel passages AV Mat 22.21 Render therefore vnto Cesar, the

things *which* are Cesars: and vnto God the things *that* are Gods—where Mk has *that* in both clauses, and Luke *which* in both.

**5.18.** In such a case as Di Do 96 the sea makes me think of *my mamma that's dead* | ib 155 like *her mother that was dead*—it is true that the relative clause does not serve to point out one among several mothers (for that of course is absurd), but still the addition is necessary and could not well be omitted; cp "her deceased mother". Similarly the following clauses may be considered not quite parenthetic: Di Do 400 Was Mr. Dombey's master-vice, that ruled him so inexorably, an unnatural characteristic? [cp his ruling vice] | Hardy W 37 the radiance made her dark eyes, that had once been handsome, seem handsome anew | Maxwell F 223 He thought of the story of her whole life—the mother that was worse than no mother . . . | Shaw 1.230 wont you take it from your own mother, that loves you and swears to you that it's truth?

Still, as in 5.21, *that* may here be interpreted as a survival of the old practice in non-restrictive clauses; cp further De Quincey 320 our poor Kate, that had for fifteen years been so tenderly rocked in the arms of St. Sebastian. After personal proper names we naturally have *who*, not *that*, in PE.

In the following passage *whom* may have been chosen as the more elevated word after the dignified word *benefactor*, while *that* was used after the more everyday word *father*:

Di X 228 The father *that* I loved so well; the father *that* I never loved enough, and never knew; the Benefactor *whom* I first began to reverence and love.

**5.19.** In most cases the pronoun *this* expresses complete identification and thus allows of a non-restrictive clause only; yet sometimes a further restriction may be added: Mackenzie S 1.371 asking themselves in whispers what man this was that came among them with so sad an expression | Merrick MG 129 On which side had he cast the weight of his opinion—this man that she had never seen?

Thus also after neutral *this*: Sh Hml I 5.153 this that you haue seen | ib 159 this that you haue heard | Carlyle H 134 This that Knox did for his Nation, we may really call a resurrection as from death.

**5.2₁.** Even after personal pronouns like *I* and *thou*, which would seem to be definite enough without further qualification, we have sometimes relative clauses that may to some extent be termed restrictive and at any rate have *that*—or should we simply consider this a survival from the time when it could be used in all kinds of relative clauses? Sheridan 236 *I, that* was left his guardian; in whose house he had been so often entertained [the additions serve to emphasize the ingratitude of the young man and thus point out, as it were, which "*I*" is concerned] | Goldsm 657 *I that* have rocked you in your cradle!

Further examples after *I*: Marl T 303 Must . . . I, that triumpht, so be ouercome? (ib 1137) | Defoe R 45 But I that was born to be my own destroyer, could no more resist | De Quincey 4 I, that am at present a truth-loving man | Scott A 1.247 he looks as auld as me, that might be his mother | Tenn 103 I that rather held it better men should perish one by one; ib 348 | Henley B 81 Shall I kill them, I that love them! | Phillpotts GR 181 I, that thought I was strong, prove so weak. [Cf with *who*: ib 187 I, who speak to you, may not be responsible | Doyle S 6.233 when I think of getting her into trouble, I who would give my life just to bring one smile to her dear face].

Cp also the set phrase: though I say it that shouldn't (thus e. g. Sheridan 349, Leight Hunt in Tenn. L 1.195); cp the same phrase with *as* 9.3₂, with *who* Wells Cl 193.

**5.2₂.** With the plural *we*, a relative clause may serve to indicate, what person or persons should be included besides the speaker (see II 4.52) and thus is restrictive in the same way as the addition *girls* in *we girls*, etc. Examples: Caxton R 105 al we that ben your frendys | Sh As II 4.54 wee that are true louers, runne into strange capers | Bacon A 43.27 wee, that have so many things | Mi C 111 We, that are of

purer fire | Goldsmith 622 among us that practise the law | Browning 1.249 We that had loved him so . . . Made him our pattern to live and to die!

In recent times, *we who*, though not very frequent, is found more often than *we that*, e. g. Di Do 389 We who are about him, have done our part; also Thack H 13.16, Mrs. Browning A 16, Hardy L 207, 216.

**5.23.** Examples of *that* after *you*: Sh Alls IV 3. 338 you that haue so traitorusly discouerd the secrets of your army, can serue the world for no honest vse | BJo 1.88 a necessary question for you that are his wife | Johnson R 65 you, that have considered them, tell me the result | Austen S 238 I should be so sorry to have you ill,—you that have been the greatest comfort to me in the world [but ib 343 in what misery should I have left you, my muse, my friend, my sister! You, *who* had seen all the fretful selfishness af my latter days].

In Sh Hml I 1.46 What art *thou that* vsurpst this time of night? the meaning is nearly the same as "Who is it that comes at this time?" or "Who are you that (or since) you come at this time?" In the same way with *you*: Ml F 310 And what are *you that* liue with Lucifer? | BJo A 3.315 *yo'*-are but yong About the towne, *that* can make that a question! | Carlyle H 138 Who are *you that* presume to school the nobles?

*Thou* not expressed: Marl T 452 But tell me, that hast seen him, Menaphon, What stature wields he?

**5.31.** Restrictive clauses are generally placed immediately after the antecedent, while non-restrictive clauses may stand at some distance. *Who* and *which*, thus, to use the expressive phrase of Alphonso Smith (Studies in Engl. Synt. 52), gain greater carrying power than *that* and hence are often preferred in the second of two *coordinated* relative clauses, even when they are restrictive and the first has *that* or no pronoun:

Swift P 48 ingenious sentences, *that* I suddenly or accidentally recollected; *and which*, without my utmost vigi-

lance, had been irrevocably lost for ever | Defoe R 2.134 things *that* neither the Spaniards, or the English men had tasted for many years; *and which*, it may be supposed, they were glad of | Cowper L 1.135 It is an observation *that* naturally occurs upon the occasion, *and which* many other occasions furnish an opportunity to make | Medwin S 116 a circumstance *that* occurred, *or which* Shelley supposed did occur | Di T 1.18 the secret *that* was always in that individuality, *and which* I shall carry in mine to my life's end | Di Do 378 a pride *that*, rightly guided, might have led perhaps to better things, *but which*, misdirected and perverted, has been self-contempt and ruin | Wells N 99 that ideal *that* we were pleased to call aristocracy *and which* soon became the common property of our set | Shaw C 163 a sort of thing *that* used to cut me to the heart, *and which* she kept up till the very day I left her | Phillpotts M 38 she possessed gifts *that* were not only higher than a ready tongue, *but which* paid better in the long run.

With a contact-clause in the first place:

Cowper L 2.218 You have sent me the very things I wanted, *and which* I should have continued to want, had not you sent them | ib 225 not even a glimpse of those I love, *and of whom* I must ere long take leave for ever | Burke Am 36 the penal laws we have passed *and which*, for the time, have been severe and numerous | Lawrence L 128 she would mock stoically at everything he said *or which* life offered.

**5.3₂.** The inverse order (*who* or *which* . . . *and that*) is rare: Defoe G 42 to teach him *who* thinks himself able to teach the world, *and that* pretends . . . | Haggard S 49 when we reached the rock, *which* he knew, *and that* appeared to be identical with the one described upon the sherd | ib 252 the delightful cool *which* at this time of the day always seemed to descend . . ., *and that* atoned for the want of any breeze.

*That* after a contact-clause: James TM 44 the dawn of an idea I myself had given her *and that* was as yet quite obscure to me.

## Continuative Relative Clauses.

**5.41.** Continuative clauses are a subdivision under non-restrictive clauses; they are always added after what might have been the end of the whole sentence, and instead of them we might just as well have had a separate sentence with *and* and a following personal pronoun. They are decidedly literary, not colloquial.

Examples (Sh, Bacon, see above 4.42) | Swift 3. 105 the nurse came in with a child in her arms; who immediately spyed me, and began a squall . . . The mother put me towards the child, who presently seized me by the middle | Goldsm V 1. 124 It did the Saracen but little injury, who lifting up his sword, fairly struck off the poor dwarf's arm | Peacock M 8 he drank the profits, and left the embankment to his deputies, who left it to their assistants, who left it to itself | Di D 234 he had seen my aunt give this person money outside the garden rails in the moonlight, who then slunk away and was seen no more | Galsw FM 202 Canynge stretches out the letter, which Twisden hands to Dancy, who takes it | Masefield S 106 In the wild weather Tio Ramón summoned Paco, who summoned Enrique, who sent Lotta to find Miguel, who shook his head.

Note here especially such indications of time as *immediately*, *presently*, *then*. In writing there is always a comma, semicolon, or even a full stop, and in speech a falling tone, before a continuative clause.

Imitation of Latin is seen in the use after a full stop: Ch G 319 To whom Cecile answerde boldely (ib. 333) | Mi PL 4.634 To whom thus Eve with perfect beauty adornd.

**5.42.** Continuative relative clauses may contain wishes and questions:

Roister 31 my spouse, whom when him please God luckily sende home | Sh R 2 II 1.129 My brother Gloucester (Whom faire befall in heauen 'mongst happy soules) | By DJ 3.50 If all the dead could now return to life, (Which God forbid!) | Scott Iv 417 these men (whom may Heaven

pardon!) | Shelley 213 There is one road To peace and that is truth, which follow ye! | Stev B 279 this Sir Daniel (whom may the saints confound!) | Carlyle H 140 the essential sin; for which what pardon can there be? | id FR 83 the Royal Authority has resources—which ought it not to put forth?

On continuative clauses with *which* as adjunct see 6.5.

**5.43.** A relative clause adjunct may be introduced by one of the relative pronominal adverbs: the place *where* I was born | the time *when* he was Ambassador in Paris | the reason *why* he was angry, etc. (But, of course, clauses like *where I was born* or *when he was Ambassador* are subjuncts if there is no antecedent to which they refer).

Such clauses may be non-restrictive or continuative as the second, but not the first clause in Bunyan P 51 I was forced to go back to the place where I slept my sleep, where [= and there] I found it [the roll], and now I am come. Further examples: Stev T 35 I helped her to the edge of the bank, where, sure enough, she gave a sigh and fell on my shoulder | Hardy W 210 he longed for the morrow, when he would see Mrs. N. again [different from: he longed for the day when he was to see her again—which is restrictive] | Stev JHF 95 I shall be back before midnight, when we shall send for the police. Continuative *when* is frequent in clause subjuncts.

**5.44.** Popular speech often prefers coordination (parataxis), where a more refined literary style prefers subordination (hypotaxis) by means of a relative clause. An interesting example is Luke vi. 6, where the Greek original (καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ) and the Latin Vulgate have coordination, which is retained in the Old English version (*þar wæs sum man*, and his *swyðre hand wæs forscruncen*) and in Wyclif's translation (*And a man was there*, and his *rizt hand was drie*), while the Authorized Version makes it into a relative clause (*and there was a man* whose *right hand was withered*); the Revised Version of 1881 returns to the original popular construction (. . . and his *right hand was withered*). Let me give just one recent example of co-ordination: Wells, *Joan and Peter*, p. 305, *There was a boy at that school*, his *father was an engineer;* and he *said that flying machines were coming.*

## Exhausted relative clauses.

**5.51.** Not infrequently a relative clause, which has been begun in the ordinary way, is continued irregularly as if the power of the relative were exhausted, a personal pronoun being substituted for it. Examples of this kind of anacoluthon: Gammer 142 It is not the first dede she hath done and afterward denide *it* | Behn 323 a ring, *which* she durst not put on her finger, but hid *it* in her bosom | Bunyan G 48 these be the men *that* God, though he chastiseth them, keeps *them* in safety by him | Defoe R 214 tame sea-fowls . . . *who* I caught upon the shore, and cut *their* wings | id M 179 three gold watches, *which* they had eyed in the daytime, and found the place where he laid *them* | id Rox 159 Amy, *whom* I now dressed like a gentlewoman and made *her* my companion | Swift 3. 42 The lanes and alleys *which* I could not enter, but only viewed *them* as I passed, are from twelve to eighteen inches | Cowper L 1.299 a reform however *which* the rabble did not at all approve of, and testified their dislike of *it* by a riot | Bosw 1.435 a fellow *whom* you must make drunk before you can get a word of truth out of *him* | Austen E 88 there are people *who*, the more you do for them, the less *they* will do for themselves | Shelley L 598 we leave this city for Pisa, *where*, or in *its* neighbourhood, we shall remain during the summer | Di M 197 a moist eye, *which* she had a remarkable power of turning up, and only showing the white of *it* | Lowell St 316 many passages *which* one is rather inclined to like than sure he would be right in liking *them* | Trollope O 100 a man of *whose* whereabouts and condition—nay, of *his* very existence —she was unaware | Ru P 2.333 they write their sins,—*which*, however, they cannot deliver on paper to the confessor, but must read *them* aloud.

**5.52.** A special case, where it seems really quite necessary to use a personal pronoun, is that in which two subjects are connected, each with its own predicative, a verb like *is* being understood after the second; if in the first

quotation we substitute *whose* for *his*, we feel it necessary to put in the verb *is*, as a verb is required after *whose eye*:

Mi S 1172 God . . . *Whose ear* is ever open, and *his eye* Gracious to readmit the suppliant | Swift T 93 a person *whose intellectuals* were overturned, and *his brain* shaken | Gosse D 66 and the Dean, *whose voice* was rich and plaintive, and *his delivery* of poetry very graceful, continued to recite the lyrical masterpieces | ib 307 there is not one of them all *whose feet* have been more firmly planted on the soil, and *his attention* more steadily fixed on the real aspects of life, than Paludan-Müller in 'Adam Homo'. | Raleigh S 50 the writer nourished on thought, *whose nerves* are braced and *his loins* girt to struggle with a real meaning | Wells B 97 will there ever be a sort of man *whose thoughts* are quick and *his acts* slow? || Hawth S 8 a stronger claim than for myself, *whose name* is seldom heard and *my face* hardly known. Cp also Quincey 78 that morning, from *which*, and from *its* consequences, my whole succeeding life has taken its colouring | Swift 3.340 a root . . . *which* the Yahoos fought for with much eagerness, and would suck *it* with great delight | Bosw 1.161 in the literary circle *with which* his Lordship was well acquainted, and was, indeed, himself one of *its* ornaments | Carlyle R 1.220 Mrs. Strachey and Mrs Montague, with *both of whom* and *their* households I became acquainted.

It would also have been practically impossible to go on with a continued relative construction instead of the personal pronoun in the following sentence: Mered T 67 I yesterday met the man *who* has but to lift his hand and I go to *him*, and *he* may lead me whither he will.

### Relative connective plus personal pronoun.

**5.61.** A relative pronoun really fills two functions: in the first place it serves to connect the clause with the rest of the sentence (generally with some antecedent), and in the second place it has its own role to play within the clause,

as subject, object, or whatever it may be. In the graphic sentence-analysis in which Miss Isabel Fry drills very small children (see her book "A Key to Language", London 1925) she therefore places *which* twice, first on a line connecting the antecedent and the bag representing the clause—in the same way as a conjunction is placed in other sentences—and then within the bag itself, where it is put in the place reserved for the subject, object, or whatever it may be. Now this logical analysis, which separates the connecting function from the case-function, has found formal expression in several languages, in which relative clauses are introduced by an invariable particle followed (sometimes at some distance) by a pronoun showing by its form or place the case relation. Such constructions are found extensively in Romanic languages, for instance in Spanish: el cabdal rio *que* todos beben *delli* 'the main stream which all drink from it' (= del qual todos beben), Diez Grammatik 3.380; Hanssen, Sp. Gr. § 54.12; Italian: è una cosa *che* non *ci* credo (= alla quale non credo), Storm EPh 802, OFr: les beles dames cortoises *que eles* ont ii amis ou iii avoc leur barons, Suchier, Aucass. et Nicolete 49, Mod Fr: un tas de farces *que* j'*en* (=dont je) pleurais de rire, Flaubert, Bov 82 | Car j'en sais une [dame] par le monde *Que* jamais ni brune ni blonde N'ont valu le bout de *son* doigt, Musset, Poésies compl. 87, cf Jespersen, Kort udsigt over det philol.-hist. samfunds virksomhed 1885, 98, Sandfeld Jensen, Franske bisætninger § 37 anm., Nyrop Gr 5.261, 327, 332 ; Greek and Lithuanian, see Brugmann, Vgl. Gramm. 2.780; Modern Persian, Semitic, Egyptian, see Misteli Charakteristik der Typen des Sprachbaues 601, Malay, see A. Seidel, Mal. Gramm. 45.

**5.62.** In OE this was the regular idiom with *þe*, e. g. Bw 441 þær gelyfan sceal dryhtnes dome se *þe hine* deaþ nimeþ | El 161 Se god *þe* þis *his* beacen wæs | CP 43 se *þe him* god suelce cræftas giefþ | Oros 80 menn *þe* mon *hiora* mægas slog.—This was continued in ME, see AR 154 Iacob, *þe* vre louerd scheawede *him* his nebschaft.—When *þe* was superseded by *þet*, *that*, the same construction was trans-

ferred to this word, e. g. AR 398 Absalones schene wlite, *þet* ase ofte ase me euesede *him*, me solde *his* euesunge (cf. also ib 44 so doð euer sumwhat *þet* god muwe *þerof* awakenen) | Ch A 43 A knight ther was . . . *That* fro the tyme that he first bigan To ryden out, *he* lovede chivalrye | Ch A 2709 Al were they sore yhurt, and namely oon, *That* with a spere was thirled *his* brest-boon | Ch HF 76 sones *That* alway for to slepe *her* wone is | Ch B 1694 a litel clergeon . . . *That* day by day to scole was *his* wone | Ch R 3032 | Mandeville 156 . . . is a welle, *that* in the day *it* is so cold . . . and in the nyght *it* is so hoot . . .

Other ME examples may be found in Mätzner 3.549, Zupitza ESt 8.396 and Guy of Warwick 181, Pabst Anglia 13.296, Kellner Blanch. xli and Hist. Synt. 66, Western Bisætn. 16 and 85, see also Murray Sc. Dial. 196, Storm EPh 802.

**5.63.** Modern English examples of *that* with following pronoun are not very frequent: Fulg 37 I knew two certayne, *That* when they were wedded *they* had in store Scarce halfe a bed | Marl F 206 by force of argument, *that* you being licentiate should stand vpon'*t* (ed 1616 argument, which . . . vpon) | Sh Merch II 5.50 to one *that* I would haue him helpe to waste *His* borrowed purse (= whose borrowed purse I would have him help to waste) | BJo 1.47 I have some papers there . . . *that* you'll say there's some sparks of wit in '*hem*, when you see them | Gissing G 221 he's just the kind of fellow *that*, if everyone leaves him alone, *he*'ll be content with five-and-twenty shillings for the rest of his life | Tarkington M A 106 there's a few people *that their* birth and position, and so on, puts *them* at the top [*them* added as an after-thought; without *them* the clause would be regular] | Lewis B 27 [a boy speaking] There's two fellows *that their* dads are millionaires | id MA 163 they cure a lot of folks *that* you regular docs can't seem to find out what's the matter with '*em* [the addition is natural on account of the length of the clause].

There seems to be a curious blending of two rel. constructions in Sh Tp II, 1, 249 She *that from whom* We all were sea-swallowed.

**5.64.** In Sc dial. *ăt* + possessive is the regular way of expressing the genitive of the relative, see Murray Dial. 196: the man *at hys* weyfe's deid 'the man whose wife is dead' | the wumman *at* ye kæn *hyr* sun 'the woman whose son you know' | the doag *at yts* læg was run ower 'the dog whose leg was run over'.—In a different way I find *'at's* used as a genitive (NB. fem.) of *at* (= 'that') in Barrie W 50 a wife *'at's* wrapper's never even on, an' wha doesna wash her mutch aince in a month.

In Ireland (see Joyce Ir. 52) it is usual to have constructions like: He looks like a man *that* there would be no money in *his* pocket | there's a man *that his* wife leaves him whenever she pleases | Poor brave Mat Donovan *that* everyone is proud of *him*, etc. Relative *whose* is totally unknown in Ireland.

Cp *as* + *his*, *it* 9.32; *but* + pronoun 9.75.

**5.65.** More frequently than with *that* we find similar constructions with *which*: in recent times however they are found in vulgar speech only. Examples: Caxton R 95 treson, *whiche* ye ought to doo justyce *theron* sharply | Sh As II 1.8 the winters winde, *Which* when *it* bites and blowes vpon my body Euen till I shrinke with cold, I smile | Lr I 4.255 I had daughters.—*Which they* will make an obedient father | Bacon A 30.6 many other high names; *which* though *they* be inferiour to his divine majestie, yet *they* are farre from the language of other iewes | Defoe M 124 an injury . . . *which* however, as I have had no hand in *it*, I desire I may be fairly acquitted of *it* | Thack P 1.62 wanting to fight Tom the post-boy; *which* I'm thinking he'd have had the worst of *it* | ib 3.326 her rights, *which* she was unjustly defrauded of *them* | Di M 439 (Mrs. Gamp) I knows a lady, *which her* name, I'll not deceive you, Mrs. Chuzzlewit, is Harris | Di Mut. Fr.: Mrs Boffin, *which her* father's name was Henery | Aldrich S 124 he began chaffing us, *which* we didn't mind *it*, seeing he was 'eavy in the 'ead | Doyle St 97 it belongs to my girl Sally, as was married only this time twelvemonth, *which her* husband is steward aboard a Union boat.

It is difficult to see how to get a satisfactory sentence out of Bosw. 1. 201 an opinion, *which* they who have never experienced its truth are not to be envied.

**5.6₆.** The same construction with *who*:

Sh VA 935 to steale his breath, *who*, when he liu'd, *his* breath and beautie set Glosse on the rose, smell to the violet | Tp III 3.31 people, *who* though they are of monstrous shape, yet note, *Their* manners are more gentle | Merch IV 1.134 a wolfe, *who* hang'd for humane slaughter, Euen from the gallowes did *his* fell soul fleet | Lewis B 122 the fellow *who* you don't know *his* name and I don't either.

In Caxton R 26 the bere myn eem *whom* I made *his* crowne al blody — *whom* may be taken as a dative ('for whom').

**5.6₇.** In this connexion I must mention the sentence "He's always polite to people he thinks he can get anything out of *them*", which occurs in Sweet's Elementarbuch § 52, and which Storm E Ph 444 terms "auffallend, fast sinnlos, statt: to people [that] he thinks he can get anything out of". Sweet himself, NEG § 118, calls it a colloquial anacoluthon. There is another example in Sweet's Elb. 49: "I knew a man, when any of *his* friends asked him to lend them some money, he used to say . . ." Such sentences resemble those dealt with in the preceding paragraphs, in which we had a caseless relative word that was resumed by a case-indicating pronoun: here there is no initial relative word any more than in "I knew the man we saw"; but while in such a simple sentence there is no necessity for indicating the case-relation, because it is easily implied, it becomes necessary to insert a pronoun for that purpose when the relation is somewhat more complicated. But literary (and even spoken) English will always avoid such constructions and use explicit relative pronouns. Still, examples are found now and then in literature, chiefly of course where vulgar speech is rendered: Ch B 271 to be bounde under subjeccioun Of oon she knoweth nat *his* condicioun | Keats 5.183 spying upon a secret I would rather die than share *it* with any body's confidence | GE S 84 There's folks, i' my opinion, *they* can't see ghos'es | Trollope

D 3.226 there are some things, though you want to say *them* ever so, you don't quite know how to do it | id O 124 She's one of them when she's your own *she*'ll remain your own all out | Sutton Vane, Outward Bound 71 you're in danger of something out there—something I don't know what *it* is.

Many grammarians would here feel inclined to talk of parataxis (cf. 5.4₄) instead of relative hypotaxis, as also in the following typical example: BJo 3.213 O, you shall have some women, when *they* laugh you would think *they* brayed, it is so rude.

### Mental parentheses.

**5.7₁.** We may place here a special kind of clause, in which the speaker (writer) interrupts the flow of the sentence to give as it were his own comment on some idea or expression. Psychologically these mental parentheses in the form of a relative clause are on the same footing as insertions such as "in other words", "as it were", "truth to say", "curiously enough", etc. Such relative clauses are clearly non-restrictive; in many cases they have no antecedent proper, and yet they cannot be classed with relative clause primaries like those treated in ch. III, because they do not function as primaries in any sentence; they stand in "extraposition" in a peculiar way, though sometimes they may be said to stand in "apposition" to some word in the sentence or to some idea implied in some part of the sentence or the sentence as a whole. Therefore some of these clauses are in most grammars described as relative clauses referring to "a whole sentence" or to "a whole thought", but, as we shall see, the rule generally given that such clauses are introduced by *what* if it precedes, and by *which* if it follows the main sentence, does not correspond with actual usage.

**5.7₂.** Examples of *what* in such mental parenthetical comments:

Defoe G 75 and what is still worse, he draws . . . | Fielding T 1.137 and, what is worse, the whole country began

to talk of her inclination to Tom | ib 1.259 one poor girl who had either drowned herself, or rather what was more probable, had been drowned by him | Ru S 18 he can say it all; and what is more strange, *will* not | Stevenson MB 52 and, what is yet more rare, his knowledge of himself equalled his knowledge of others | Dickinson S 85 and if ever, what is even more difficult, we should come to know . . . | Zangwill G 245 And what's more, Peter, I tell you once for all...

**5.73.** As *what* generally means the same thing as *that which*, it is not surprising to find also this combination, though it is now obsolete; *that* may be said to be in apposition to "the whole thought", and *which* is added to it in the ordinary way. Examples:

Bacon A 16. 13 you shall understand (that which perhaps you will scarce think credible) that . . . | Defoe R 2. 107 our army was but small indeed; but that which was worse, they had not arms (frequent in Defoe).

**5.74.** A noticeable variety of these clauses is seen in the following examples, in which the parenthesis is clearly stylistic: Carlyle H 99 To know a thing, *what we can call knowing*, a man must first love the thing | ib 101 no man who can laugh, *what we call laughing*, will laugh at these things | id FR 487 [Sansculottism] others will lean heartily on it; nay others again will lean *what we call heartlessly* on it | Smedley F 2.351 I *what the females call sympathise* with you | Benson D 13 I can't pretend that I am *what is known as being in love* with him | Shaw Ms 19 but I'm not *what you call gone* about him | Galsw SS 181 Why don't you have her *what you call shadowed*? | Bennett ECh 227 I've never *what you'd call toured* | id 238 her notions . . . were *what is called advanced.*

**5.75.** Examples of parenthetic *which*-clauses:

Sh Mids I 1.103 And (which is more then all these boasts can be) I am beloued of beauteous Hermia (many other examples Sh-Lex 1360) | Mi A 32 Nay, which is more lamentable, if the work of any deceased author . . . | ib 38 the privilege of the people nullify'd, and which is wors, the free-

dom of learning must groan again | Mi S 1718 And, which is best and happiest yet, all this with God not parted from him | Defoe R 271 and which was more than all, I fix'd a rudder (ib 188) | id R 2.109 and our men, which was the worst of their fate, had no advantage in their situation | id G 42, 58, 91 | Cowper L 2.33 At the Swan they have no horses, or, which is equally negative in such a case, they have but one | Thack N 391 If, which very seldom happens, there are two such imperious spirits in a family | Troll B 301 He saw, which Eleanor had failed to see, that much more had been intended | ib 362 He also decided, which was more to his purpose, that Eleanor did not care a straw for him | Ru S 84 and if, which would be further necessary, you could fix the value . . . | Kipl L 49 even though they were—which they ain't—all you say they are . . . | Dickinson S 120 I am interested in wine. And—which is the point—I know that the wine is always there | Galsw C 73 I regard marriage as sacred, and when, which God forbid, it proves unsacred, it is horrible . . .

**5.76.** The clause with *which* serves only to modify one single word or a part of the sentence: Sh Wiv II 2.78 there has beene Earles: nay, (which is more) pentioners | Dickinson C 12 its effects not merely on the sum total of our wealth, but (which we conceive to be a very different thing) on our national well-being | Di Do 57 Mr. Dombey's young child was so important to him as part of his own greatness, or (which is the same thing) of the greatness of Dombey and Son.

Cf *which*-clauses after what they refer to, 6. 47.

**5.77.** Similar clauses with *ever*-pronouns: He is one of the moderns, *whatever that may mean* | Di D 6 when she came to herself, or when Miss Betsy had restored her, *whichever it was* | Stevenson M 62 his former friends or masters (*whichever they had been*) | id B 97 The leper looked or listened, *whichever he was really doing, for some seconds.*

## Chapter VI.

## Differentiation of the wh-pronouns.

(Gender, etc.)

**6.1.** In OE we had the following forms:

| | m. f. | n. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nom. | *hwa* | *hwæt* | |
| Acc. | *hwone* | *hwæt* | |
| Dat. | *hwam* | *hwam* | (*hwon*, *hwy*) |
| Gen. | *hwæs* | *hwæs* | |

besides the pronoun *hwilc* (*hwlyc*, *hwelc*), which was inflected like an ordinary strong adjective.

These were chiefly used as interrogatives, but in course of time came to be used as relatives as well, in OE first in the combination *swa hwa swa*, *swa hwæt swa* in the meaning 'whoever, whatever', later in other kinds of relative clause-primaries (without 'antecedent') and still later in clause-adjuncts (with 'antecedent').

The separate accusative form *hwone* soon disappeared, the dative form taking its place. In Early ME *hwam* might still refer to the names of things, as in Vices and V. 47 of ðessere hali mihte, wiðuten hwam non ne mai bien wiðhealden | AR 220 openliche uondunges, bi hwam he seið al so (probably also ib. 44 þonkeð him of his geoue, wiðuten hwam we ne muwen ne wel don ne wel þenchen—where *hwam* might, however, refer to *him*), but soon *what* came to be used even after those prepositions which in OE took the dative.

**6.2₁.** The differentiation of these pronouns in ME and ModE is a very complicated affair, because several distinctions, which are in themselves mutually independent, cross each other in various ways; in the following survey these are denoted by initials, namely

(1) Class: the distinction between (a) interrogative (I), (b) relative without antecedent, i. e. in relative clause-primaries ($R_1$), and (c) relative with antecedent, i. e. in relative clause-adjuncts ($R_2$);

(2) Rank of the pronoun itself: the distinction between (a) primary (P) and (b) adjunct pronouns (A);

(3) Gender: the distinction between (a) personal or animate (M, standing for Man) and (b) non-personal or inanimate (N, standing for Neuter);

(4) Limitation: the distinction between (a) an unlimited (U) and (b) a limited number (L).

The initial M was chosen for 3 a, though referring not only to men, because neither P (personal) nor A (animate) could be used, as these letters were already used in 2.

**6.2₂.** Some examples will illustrate this. Those in parentheses are rare.

*Who:* Who said that? IPMU.
You may marry whom you like. $R_1$PMU.
The man who said that. $R_2$PM.

*Whose:* Whose is it? IPMU.
Whose hat did he take? IAMU.
(I shall accept whose company I choose. $R_2$AMU.)
(The man whose it was. $R_2$PM.)
The man whose hat he took. $R_2$AM.
A hill, whose peak was buried in the fog. $R_2$AN.

*Which:* Which of you did it? IPML.
Which is the nearest road? IPNL.
Which boy did you say? IAML.
Which road is the nearest? IANL.
You may take which of the apples you like. $R_1$PNL.
The road which leads to London. $R_2$PN.
Their wives and daughters, which ladies set him down as dull. $R_2$AM.
He promised many things, which promises he did not keep. $R_2$AN.

*What:* What did he say? IPNU.
What gods did they worship? IAMU.
What books did he read? IANU.
There's nobody but what is glad to see you. $R_1$PMU.
I gave him what I had. $R_1$PNU.
I gave him what money I had. $R_1$ANU.
(vg) A boy what stole some apples. $R_2$PM.
(vg) The apples what the boy stole. $R_2$PN.

**6.3₁.** The development that presents the greatest interest in these matters is the gradual restriction of the sphere of *which*: as an interrogative and in relative clause-primaries it has been restricted to reference to a limited number (4b; L), while as an ordinary relative it has been restricted to the non-personal use (3b; N) except when used as an adjunct, in which case it may also be used of persons (3a, M). Here we shall speak first of the differentiation of *who* and *which* as relatives.

**6.3₂.** Examples of the now obsolete personal use of *which*, where now *who* would be used, abound in the early ModE period, e. g. Marlowe T 2682 Twise twenty thousand valiant men at armes, *All which* haue sworn to sacke Natolia | Sh H4B I. 1.98 And he doth sinne that doth belye the dead: Not *he*, *which* sayes the dead is not aliue | H5 I 2.65 King *Pepin*, *which* deposed Childerike. A. Schmidt's Sh-Lex. p. 1360, first column, has scores of examples.

In the AV of the Bible *which* (though rarer than *that*) is extremely often used referring to persons; *who* is comparatively rare and is chiefly used in continuative clauses. Still, there are some indications of the modern gender distinction, even apart from the fact that *who* can never be applied to inanimates; *who* sometimes seems to have been used to avoid mistakes as to the antecedent, e. g. Deut. 8.14 the Lord thy God, *which* brought thee foorth out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage, *who* led thee through that great and terrible wildernesse, wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and drought, where there was no water, *who* brought thee foorth water out of the rocke of flint, *who* fed thee in the wildernesse with manna, which thy fathers knew not . . . Further, as J. M. Grainger, *Studies in the Syntax of the King James Bible*, points out, *which* is never used referring to a person, when preceded by a preposition, see e. g. Gen. 30.26 Giue mee my wiues and my children, *for whom* I haue served thee | ib. 24.40 the Lord, *before whom* I walke.

A well-known example of *which*, where now *who* would

be used, occurs in the Lord's Prayer: Our father, *which* art in heauen. Luke 15.7 iust persons, which need no repentance.

This old use of *which* was retained in most places in the British Revised Version of 1881, while the American Commission substituted *who* or *that* for *which* in these cases. As an example of the change I shall give Mat. 5.6 A. V. Blessed are *they which* doe hunger and thirst after righteousness—in the R. V. this has become: Blessed are *they that* hunger and thirst after righteousness. The 20th C. Version has the more idiomatic: Happy are *those that* hunger and thirst for the right.

I shall give only a few more examples of the old usage: Walton A 49 my hostis (which is both cleanly and conveniently handsome) | Defoe R 2.214 the savage, which we had taken prisoner of war (frequent in Defoe) | Swift 3.380 three servants, none of which were suffered to attend at meals.

**6.3₃.** The modern practice is common from the 17th c. (thus Milton, Bunyan, etc.). In the 19th c. *which* is sometimes found more or less archaically, as in Tennyson 117 that landscape-painter *Which* did win my heart from me.

Other recent examples of *which* in speaking of persons have been collected by Bøgholm, Anglia 38. 507f., van Draat, ib. 39. 268f., Reinius, Studier i modern språkvetensk., Uppsala 1914, and Wendt, Syntax p. 216. Some of these, however, prove nothing, as the pronoun is used predicatively (see below, 6, 4₄). In some of the quotations given *which* refers nominally to the word *authors*, but really rather to their works. The sentence quoted from Punch, "It isn't the cooks which are the problem" is very badly constructed, but "It isn't the cooks who are the problem" would not be much better; the best seems to be "It isn't the cooks that is the problem", cf. 4.6 on *it is*.

In Trollope W 91 "the marvellous advocate which had now taken up their cause" — the reference is to a newspaper, and that accounts for the neuter pronoun. Mary Shelley F 24 "five hungry babes. Among these there was one which attracted my mother far above all the rest". *Which* is used here referring to the babe in the same way as *it* is frequently said of a babe, whose sex is unknown or of no interest.

*Which* = 'and this [neuter]' in Defoe M 70 his mother was alive and lived in it [the house], and one sister, which was [N.B. sg.] all the relations he had.

**6.34.** The modern preference for *who* with reference to a person has not only crowded out *which* in that employment, but even tends to affect the use of *that*, which formerly was used more freely of persons than now (8.13).

**6.35.** With reference to the names of animals, the rule may be given that *who* is used where *he* or *she* would be used, but *which* where *it* would be used (see in vol. IV the chapter on Sex and Gender).

Examples: Fielding 6.59 a poor *hare*, *which* is certain, whenever *it* ventures aboad, to meet *its* enemies | Di Do 66 she had an old black *cat*, *who* generally lay coiled . . . *his* eyes.

But inconsistencies are by no means rare in both directions. Defoe R 354 a poor *horse which* . . . of *him* | Scott Iv 187 *horse*, *which* . . . unsaddled *him* | Darwin L 1 113 In my memory there were only two *dogs which* had much connection with my father. One was a large retriever, called Bob, to *which* we, as children, were much devoted. *He* was the dog of *whom* the story of the 'hot house face' is told . . . | Wilde L 195 the howling *swan*, *which*, still looking down, waileth *her* end | Galsw D 224 a *dog*, *who*, left at home . . . takes at once to those who make much of *it*.

I have found *who* used referring to *wolves* Defoe R 348 and 358, *fowl* Johnson R 38, *rooks and jackdaws* Di D 210, *mice* Di Do 271, *a kitten* Ru Collingwood 355, *spiders and mice* Ritchie M 187, *mice and frogs and rabbits* Benson N 193 —thus evidently even in cases where *it* would have been used.

**6.36.** Such collectives as *party*, *nation*, *society*, etc., may be referred to either with *which* or with *who*: in the former case the idea of unity, and in the latter that of plurality is prevalent, the verb of the clause varying accordingly, see vol. II 4.85. Cp. also Galsw SS 220 *nations who* went in for 'circuses' were decadent | NP 25 all the six *nations with whom* we had direct or indirect dealings at Locarno behaved well | Wells OH 533 most of the smaller German *states*, *who* dreaded the schemes of *Prussia*, fought on the side of Austria.

**6.37.** With names of countries, etc., *which* is used, when the idea is purely geographical: *Norway*, *which* is more mountainous than Sweden. But when a country is thought of as a political agent, *who* may be used, corresponding to the use of *she*. There is, however, a good deal of vacillation.

Examples: Sh Ant III 6.20 Let *Rome* be thus inform'd, *Who* . . . Will *their* good thoughts call from him | Tennyson 575 To *Canada*, *whom* we love and prize | Muir Expansion of Europe 76 the main part was played by *Britain*, *who* found *herself* left free to expand | Lecky D 1.35 *France*, *which* more than any other country claims the paternity of this form of government . . . *she* seemed peculiarly fitted for it | London C 181 *Japan*, *who* but yesterday emerged from the mediæval rule . . . is to-day showing what wisdom *she* has acquired | Ru C 154 it is the *country* you have left behind *who* is to command | ib 156 No *country* is in a healthy state *which* has separated *her* civil from *her* military power.—In recent newspapers I think *who* is more common than *which* in such cases: NP 20 it is *Great Britain* rather than America *who* is likely to suffer most. But *which* is quite natural in Lang Tenn 19 *Cambridge*, *which* he was soon to leave, did not satisfy the poet.

**6.38.** Shakespeare sometimes uses *who* of things which he personifies: Tp I 2.7 a braue *vessell* (*Who* had no doubt some noble creature in her) | H 4 B III 1.22 the *winds who* take the ruffian billowes by the top. Similarly in modern poets; Shelley is very fond of personifying natural objects, as in Sens. Plant: *narcissi*, the fairest of them all, *who* gaze on their eyes in the stream's recess, Till they die of their own dear loveliness. In Prom. Unb. similarly of mountains, rivers, etc. Cf. also Mary Shelley F 200 the *sun* and the *heavens*, *who* have witnessed my operations | Defoe R 174 *Nature*, *who* gives supplies of food to every creature.

It is curious that the only example in Chaucer of *who* as a relative nominative is Ros 4194, where 'personification' seems excluded: Men seyn over the walle stonde Grete engynes, who were nigh honde. Skeat unwarrantably emends into *which*, though both our old authorities have *who*. But it is, of course, doubtful whether this was written by Chaucer.

**6.41.** By means of the two forms *who* and *which* one may sometimes avoid ambiguity if the relative is at some distance from the antecedent (cf. what was said in 5.31 of the greater carrying power of the *wh*-pronouns); in the same way the French use *lequel* and *laquelle* instead of *qui* where it may be doubtful which word is the antecedent; and the existence of the plural forms *lesquels*, *lesquelles*, even allows the French some facilities in this respect which are not found in English, as *who* and *which* correspond to both numbers. Examples: Spect. 232 *several* had been entertained with musick *who had passed by the rock* | Cowper L 2.204 you will give my *love* to her, *which* I therefore send you | Shelley PW 2.161 *Thousands* tremble before thy throne, *who*, at my voice, shall dare to pluck the golden crown from thine unholy head! | Mary Shelley F 119 Happy earth! fit *habitation* for gods, *which*, so short a time before, was bleak, damp, and unwholesome | Huxley LS 62 to expect *any one* to solve a problem in conic sections *who* had merely been taught the definitions of mathematical science | Whitney G 113 *words* worn out by the use of persons who have put neither knowledge nor feeling into them, and *which* seem incapable of expressing anything that is real.

Note the difference in the following sentence: I saw there a man from the country whom (or, which) I particularly dislike.

**6.42.** On the other hand, *that* may often be used without fear of ambiguity even if the antecedent is some way back; thus no one would doubt that it is the repast and not the desert that is restorative in Mary Shelley's sentence, F 220 sometimes a repast was prepared for me in the desert that restored and inspirited me.—In Sh H5 IV 1.276 I am the King that find thee—the form of the verb *find* shows that *I*, not *King*, is the antecedent, but the construction is not felt as natural nowadays.

**6.43.** If a relative refers to two coordinate antecedents, one of which would require *who* and the other *which*, the rule is stated in many grammars that *that* must be used (even in

non-restrictive sentences), and examples like these are given: The cabmen and cabs that are found in London (Imm. Schmidt) | he was pleased to get away from a neighbourhood and a landlord that were alike disagreeable to him (Roorda) | Persons and things that take my fancy set my pencil in motion (Krüger).

I do not know whether these sentences have been found in actual language or have been framed by the grammarians themselves in illustration of the rule, which is just of the kind that would naturally present itself to the mind of a reflecting philologist. But as a matter of fact such combinations are generally avoided, at any rate by careful writers, and I have found very few examples and singularly enough, *that* is used in none of them: Darwin L 1.111 the laugh of a man who gives himself sympathetically and with enjoyment *to the person and the thing which* have amused him | Thack P 63 Was it *the punch, or the punch-maker who* intoxicated him? | Dillon Fortn. Rev. Febr. '16.217 it is from *the men and the system who* are answerable for these results that we look for final victory | Beresford Mount. Moon 87 He has no use for *anything or anyone who* isn't part of Stratton.

In most cases it will be seen that that pronoun is chosen which fits the last word preceding it. Saintsbury is conscious of the grammatical difficulty when he writes (Letter-Book 228) There are certain *subjects and persons who and which* always cause difference of opinion.

**6.44.** Sentences like this, "He is not the man which his father wanted him to be" or "he is a gentleman, which his brother is not" are often given by grammarians as examples of *which* referring to nouns denoting persons, and a special rule is then given that this is still possible "when it expresses the idea of estate, rank, dignity" (Curme) or "in reference to character, function, or the like" (NED, *which* 9c). But the reason for the use of *which* is simply this that the relative is a predicative, and predicatives in English, as in many other languages (see PG 242), are felt to be neuter, as shown

by the use of *it* and *what:* the quality, not the person, is thought of (Cf also 8.16). Examples with substantives as predicatives:

Mrs. Browning A 61 a good man, which my brother was | Di H 54 I am a Mule too, which you're not | Tracy P 189 If I were his wife, which, thank goodness, I shall not be now | Raleigh Sh 26 to become a popular playwright, which Shakespeare certainly was, a man must adapt his treatment of life to the requirements of the stage | Bennett LR 1 Dressed like the country gentleman which he was not and never would be | Galsw T 261 he might have been taken for that colonel of Volunteers which indeed he was in a fair way of becoming.—An interesting example with the predicative after a preposition: Wells Ma 2.119 He admired the capable lady into which Marjorie had developed; cp with *as* (which is the typical preposition with predicatives) McDougall Group Mind 67 to become an outcast, as which he would very soon succumb in the struggle for life.

**6.45.** Examples with adjectives: Carlyle FR 477 Authorities that are free to speak, which the King himself is not | Benson C 16 even when you are patient, which you so seldom are | Butler W 89 she was fond of her boy, which Theobald never was (when the antecedent is an adjective, the clause is always non-restrictive, and analogous to the mental parentheses in 5.7).

Note also in this connexion the use of the neuter *what*: Gissing G 324 She had now become what she always desired to be, Amy's intimate friend | McKenna SM 175 she treated him like a tame cat, which is what he was.

It is of course also possible to use *that* as a predicative: Galsw Ca 733 Molly, who kept house for the confirmed bachelor that Steer was. In restrictive relative clauses *that* (or a contact-clause 7.41) would be preferred to *which* as a predicative. But the relative *who* can never be a predicative.

**6.46.** *Which* is similarly neuter when it refers to the verbal idea contained in some previous verbal form; *which*

here represents, as it were, an infinitive and may first be governed by some form of the auxiliary *do*.

Examples: Shelley L 945 until we meet—which we now must, at all events, soon do | Di X 18 It beckoned Scrooge to approach, which he did | id D 188 if he ever went anywhere else, which he don't | id Do 78 when he called, which he often did | Carlyle FR 358 Solemn enough, did we think of it,—which unhappily we do not very much | Troll B 201 Mrs. G. was soon abusing him, which she did with her whole heart | Hardy R 64 rough steps enabled any one to mount the bank; which the woman did || passive: Swift 3.68 when my cloaths were finished, which was done in my house . . .

Next, *which* may be dependent on some other auxiliary: Shelley (Medwin 349) I can make words, which you cannot | Shaw A 190 I can be civil and kind to people, which is more than you can.

**6.47.** Neuter *which* may be said to refer to a whole sentence (or nexus) in the following quotations (cf on the use of *what* and *which* before a sentence 5.7).

Austen M 150 Then he is your cousin, which makes all the difference | Di Do 81 I have come on my own account, which I hope you'll pardon | Stevenson M 69 if ever they came up again, which God alone can tell, it would be at the far end of Aros | Kipl L 49 you aren't strong enough to trifle with them—or with yourself, which is more | Bennett A 45 Had I to live again, which Apollo forbid, I would pursue the same policy | id W 2.217 she felt chilly, which was bad for her sciatica | I go there whenever I have time, which isn't often.

*All which* refers to the whole of a preceding argument: Ru M 37 [beginning of §] All which sounds very strange.

**6.48.** I subjoin a collection of sentences similar to those dealt with in the preceding paragraphs; they are easy to understand, but not easily classifiable: Hardy R 184 anybody who has been kind to me—which Thomasine has not particularly | Swift 3.66 When the girls are twelve years old, which among them is the marriageable age || Di Do 283

Here was no audience for Lovely Peg, even if there had been anybody to sing it, which there was not | Sh H5 IV 1.7 For our bad neighbours makes us early stirrers, which [= being early stirrers] is both healthfull, and good husbandry.

**6.51.** *Which* may be used as an adjunct. This is never found in restrictive clauses, but only in a peculiar kind of appositive clause; very often the clause is at some distance from the antecedent, and some substantive is repeated so as to avoid any doubt as to what word is to be taken as the antecedent. This is only literary, but at best it is a rather clumsy device and is avoided by many writers.

Examples with names of persons: Sh As I 2.134 The eldest of the three wrastled with Charles the Dukes wrastler, which Charles in a moment threw him [*which*, or *who*, alone might be understood of the Duke] | Swift 1.264 he takes any person of quality up to the said scaffold, which person pulls off his shoes | Cowper L 1.212 he rode twenty miles to see her picture in the house of a stranger, which stranger politely insisted on his acceptance of it | Brontë V 87 By *we* I mean the bonne, the cook, the portress, and myself, all which personages were now gathered in the small chamber | Merriman S. 94 Some of them introduced him to their wives and sisters, which ladies set him down as dull | Locke W 83 Montaigne, to which genial author he had been recommended by Fortinbras | Bennett PL 309 a young woman with a wedding-ring and a baby, which baby she carried about with her when serving at the table.

It will be seen that in some instances it would be possible to express the same idea by means of an ordinary apposition followed by *who*: Montaigne, a genial author who had been recommended . . . But through the other construction the indefinite article is avoided: *a genial author* . . . would presuppose ignorance as to the existence of such an author on the part of the reader.

A special case is *which latter*, where *latter* is a primary; sometimes also *which last*: Wells OH 364 the scandalous

Popes John XI and John XII, which latter was deposed by the Emperor Otto | Byron DJ 5.100 Baba and Juan, which last stood admiring.

**6.52.** Examples of *which* as adjunct of some name of thing: Ch F 709 maden layes . . .; which layes with hir instruments they songe | ib F 1129 which book | Sh Hml II 2.263 were it not that I haue bad dreames.—Which dreames indeed are ambition | Bunyan P 82 all the dangers of his solitary way, which dangers, tho he feared them more before, yet he saw them more clearly now | id G 14 I continued about a year; all which time our neighbours did take me to be a very godly man | Swift 3.20 a fortnight; during which time the Emperor gave orders to have a bed prepared for me | Defoe M 206 I happened upon a name, a family of which name lived at Hadley | Cowper L 2.21 I have a chain and a collar; the history of which collar and chain Mrs. Unwin shall give you | Mary Shelley F 132 he had hired a vessel to convey him to Constantinople, for which city he should sail in a few hours | Lamb R 9 the application of the moral (which said application she was old enough to have made herself) | Di T 1.10 sure of nothing but the horses; as to which cattle he could have taken his oath that they were not fit for the journey | id D 289 A murmur of voices . . . and . . . a clapping of hands: which latter noise, I was surprised to see, proceeded from Mrs. Gummidge | Carlyle FR 424 they demand bread-and-cheese first;—before which brief repast be eaten, the whole Village is permeated | id S 32 Wives of quality have train-gowns four or five ells in length; which trains there are boys to carry | Bennett R 109 he had acquired an assurance of the artiste's duplicity, which assurance had made it easier for him to disappoint her | Mackenzie S 1.196 between six and seven o'clock, at which latter hour they would dress for dinner | ib 1.115 for Charterhouse, near which school his people had taken a large house | Butler Er 254 the butterfly lays an egg, which egg can become a caterpillar, which caterpillar can become a chrysalis, which chrysalis can become a butterfly.

**6.5₃.** Sometimes the construction is loose, there being no word to which the apposition can be strictly referred:

Defoe G 34 they were Neapolitans, or Milanese, or Flemish, or Burgundians, all which countries were formerly subjects of the King of Spain || Di F 408 . . . glad to track some part of the way. With which singular words he abandoned his search | Huxley LS 58 the instruction of the intellect in the laws of nature, under which name I include not merely things, . . . but men | Galsw T 328 my niece Irene Forsyte, born Irene Heron, by which name she now goes | Bennett A 95 Should she arrive early, in which case she would have to talk more?

**6.5₄.** In this way *which* can be made the adjunct of a nexus-word (nomen actionis) that covers the idea expressed by a preceding verb; this may be compared with the kind of apposition found in such combinations as Huxley LS 62 he believes that his rulers are the cause of his sufferings—a belief which sometimes bears remarkable practical fruits.

Examples of *which* as adjunct in such cases:

Swift 3.138 to think I enlarged a little . . . To avoid which censure, I fear I have too much run into the extream | Cowper L 1.259 he was ordered to be whipt, which operation he underwent at the cart's tail | Carlyle R 1.8 The fault was that he exaggerated (which tendency I also inherit) | Ru M 98 England and Tuscany must exchange their steel and oil. Which exchange should be as frank and free as honesty and the sea-winds can make it | Hardy R 377 it was necessary that he should go . . .; for which purpose he decided to pass the night on the premises | Bennett W 2.133 She had forgotten to wind it up, which omission indicated that the grocer had perturbed her more than she thought.

Cp also AV Gen 34.7 hee had wrought folly in Israel, in lying with Iacobs daughter; which thing ought not to be done.

**6.5₅.** The relative clause may also be in apposition to the whole contingency expressed in a temporal clause:

Di N 29 especially when he smiled, at which times his expression bordered closely on the villainous.

**6.61.** *Whose* from of old was the gen. of *what* as well as of *who* and therefore also as a relative may refer to things as well as to persons. An early ME example is AR 190 þet þing . . . hwas scheadewe; the earliest example in NED is from 1382.

Mod examples are Marlowe T 762 To weare a *crowne* enchac'd with pearle and golde, *Whose* vertues carie with it life and death | Sh R 2 II 1.19 Lasciuious *meeters*, to whose venom sound The open eare of youth doth always listen | Sh Hml III 2.24 *playing*, whose end . . . is to hold as 'twer the mirrour vp to nature | Shelley L 632 *vines*, whose broad leaves are now stamped with the redness of their decay | Brontë P 155 Her *eyes*, whose colour I had not at first known | Black F 1.117 the spacious *landscape* whose meadows and hedges | Stevenson T 94 a *hill*, whose peak was still buried in the fog | Hope Q 3 a tiny *flat* whose windows overlooked Hyde Park | Wilde D 35 I am jealous of *everything* whose beauty does not die | Galsw Ca 192 in a *country* whose rainfall is superior to that of England.

**6.62.** There is nowadays a strong tendency to use *of which* instead of *whose* when referring to a thing, because the genitive is on the whole restricted to names of living beings. We have both combined in Brontë V 2 she saw events coming, *whose* very shadow I scarce guessed; yet *of which* the faint suspicion sufficed to impart unsettled sadness (*of wh.* necessary, because it is the 'objective genitive', cf the article *the*).

*Whose* however is preferable after the preposition *of*: Locke St 204 something had happened during his absence, *of whose nature* he was ignorant.

**6.71.** On *what* as a relative in clause primaries see 3.4. In clause adjuncts *what* is not much used. It is rarely found in the combination *all what*. There seems to be only one instance in Sh (Tim IV 2.35), NED (*what* rel. 7) has quotations from 1597, 1718, 1740, and 1919. But *all that* is decidedly much more natural.

Franz Sh-Gr § 342 mentions also *nothing what* and *every whit what*, but in his examples (I fear nothing what can be said against me | who made good every whit what John had before told) I take *nothing* and *every whit* to be subjuncts, and the *what*-clauses to be the object of *fear* and *made good*.

**6.7₂.** In vulgar and dialectal speech *what* is used in relative clause adjuncts, not only referring to things, as in Shaw 2.115 Thats the same what I hused to think | London V 88 That'd be a fight what is (=real, regular)—but also

referring to persons: Di (q) This here boy, wot the parish wants to 'prentis | Thack N 149 (schoolboy speaking) This is the fellow what can draw | Ridge S 85 a young man what says things like that | Shaw C 24 I dont call no man a fighting man what aint been in the ring | Wells Tw 91 a chap what was engaged to 'er sister | Jenkins B 77 It's my mother wot's dead. Cf EDGr § 423: in some of the north-midland counties and in nearly all the counties south of the north midlands. In w. Som. it is only used when special emphasis is required.

## Interrogative Pronouns.

**6.8₁.** The differentiation of the interrogative *wh*-pronouns has taken place along different lines from that of the relatives. From of old *who* has been personal (animate, M), and *what* non-personal (inanimate, neuter, N), though when it came to be used as an adjunct (II 16.52) it could also be used with personal substantives: *what woman* would dare to go there?

*Whose* in a question always refers to a person.

**6.8₂.** *Which* (orig. *hwilic*) was originally an adjective, as indicated by its ending and inflexion (cp *such*, compound with the same *lic*), but it soon came to be used alone, as a primary. At first it might be used in all kinds of questions, but gradually it was restricted to those in which the question is about a definite number of persons or things. The modern distinction seems to have been carried through pretty much

as now from the sixteenth or seventeenth century, though cases will always occur in which it is difficult to draw the line. To the remarks in II 7.82 very little need be added. First two quotations to show *which* referring to a predicative and to a verbal idea: McKenna SS 92 "they get frightened or become reckless"—"Which am I?" | Page J 209 I saw or felt, I know not which, that her eyes were on me.

Next a few quotations for *who* asking about a definite number: (Ch A 1348 Who hath the worse, Arcite or Palamoun?) | Churchill C 321 you three girls will have a race to see who makes up her room first | Butler W 259 Which did he now think was most likely to have taken the juster view of life and things, and whom would it be best to imitate, Towneley or Pryer? (Note the vacillation between the superlative and the comparative as well as that between *which* and *who*.)

In Sh Sonn 84. 1 it is doubtful whether we have interrogative or relative *which*: most editions think the first and print: Who is it that says most? Which can say more Than this rich praise, that you alone are you? But the old quarto has a comma after *most*: Who is it that sayes most, which can say more, Then this rich praise, that you alone, are you.

**6.83.** It has already been mentioned (3.56, 3.67) that when *which* stands in relative clause primaries (whichever, which you like) it has the same specializing character as interrogative which and thus is different from the ordinary relative *which*.

**6.84.** Nowadays the question "What is he?" always refers to character, office, place in society, or the like, while "Who is he?" is said when one wants to know the name, etc.; but up till the end of the 17th c. *what* was used in questions of the latter kind: Beow 233 hwæt þa men wæron | Ælfric (NED) Hwæt eart þu? He andwirde and cwæð: Ic eom Esau | Marl F 310 And what are you that liue with Lucifer? | Congreve 200 What was that Epictetus?—This may be compared with the neuter in the old idiom: Beow 11 þæt wæs god cyning. In most cases we may take *what* as the predicative, and then we are allowed to see in the phenome-

non the universal tendency to make the predicative neuter (see PG 242 and above 6.44); the same is true of those cases of *what* meaning 'whoever' and of *whatsoe(v)er* = whoever, that Schmidt quotes, Sh-Lex. *what* 4b and *whatsoe(v)er* b.

---

## Chapter VII.

## Contact-Clauses.

**7.11.** In sentences like the following,

He has found the key you lost yesterday,
This is the boy we spoke of,
There is a man below wants to speak to you,

we have a phenomenon which plays a very prominent part in MnE and requires a full treatment here. The clauses "you lost yesterday", "we spoke of", and "wants to speak to you" have no independent existence, they are adjuncts to "the key", "the boy", and "a man below" and must be termed relative clauses, exactly as those synonymous clauses which we should have had, if the relative word *that* (or *which*, *who*) had been inserted before "you", "we", and "wants".

These clauses are here termed contact-clauses, because what characterizes them is the close contact between the antecedent and the clause. No pause is possible before the beginning of the clause, and the words "the key", "the boy", and "a man below" are felt to be just as intimately connected with what follows as with what precedes them. The close connexion is, perhaps, felt even more strongly in cases like "The key you lost yesterday has now been found in the garden", where the main verb comes after the whole clause. It is customary in these cases to say that the relative pronoun *who* (*whom*) or *which* is "understood" or "omitted", and the clauses are called elliptic. But here as so often in grammatical disquisitions these terms really explain nothing. I very much doubt whether anyone without any grammatical

training would think that anything is left out in the sentences mentioned above. If we speak here of "omission" or "subaudition" or "ellipsis", the reader is apt to get the false impression that the fuller expression is the better one as being complete, and that the shorter expression is to some extent faulty or defective, or something that has come into existence in recent times out of slovenliness. This is wrong: the constructions are very old in the language and have not come into existence through the dropping of a previously necessary relative pronoun.

**7.1₂.** In OE there are very few examples of contact-clauses, and most of them are of a type not preserved in MnE, in which a name or a title with a verb is added more or less parenthetically in a way that is also found in ON, ODan., MHG and other languages, e. g. Chron 906 Her on þys geare gefor Ælfred wæs æt Baðum gerefa | Or. 10 betux þære ie Indus & þære þe be westan hiere is Tigris hatte; thus also in ME: Lag. 1 An preost was on leoden Lagamon was ihaten | Ch B 4039 she hadde a cok, hight Chauntecleer, and in the 15th c. Mal. 55 thenne syr Ector ranne vnto a knyght hyghte lardans. But it is not till the ME period that the types that survive till the present age come into existence, especially those in which the relative pronoun, if put, would have been an object.

**7.1₃.** Our constructions are often explained on the so-called *apo-koinou* principle, according to which something is expressed only once instead of twice, but in such a way that the hearer connects it both with what precedes and with what follows: this would be a kind of syntactical parallel to what in phonology is termed haplology (vol. I 7.8). This may account for some cases, and at any rate may describe the psychological feeling even in Present English sentences like those given above. But the explanation is not sufficient, and if it is admitted, we must at any rate say that the construction was soon extended to cases in which there is no element that can strictly be said to belong to both parts of the sentence. Thus OE Gen. 29.29 Se fæder hire sealde ane

þeowene Bala hatte—where *þeowene* is in the accusative, while in the clause it should be in the nom. Similarly in seven sentences quoted by Anklam (Das engl. relativ im 11. u. 12. jahrh., p. 6) from Chron. MS H 1114, all of the same formula: he geaf þæt abbotrice on Eoforwic Ricarde wæs munuc, with *Ricarde* (and similarly *Rodberte*, *Davide*, etc) in the dative, which in the clause should have been the subject. In the later language, too, we have many sentences with contact-clauses in which the *apo-koinou* explanation cannot be applied on account of the word-order, as the common element does not stand in the middle, e. g. Sh Merch IV 1.47 Some men there are loue not a gaping pigge | How much was it he stole?—and similar sentences probably were spoken by the hundred already in the ME period.

**7.14.** It is, therefore, perhaps safer to say that this phenomenon is an after-effect of old speech-habits from the time when pronouns were not required to the same extent as in later times: *wæs* (*was*) or the original form from which it sprung meant very often what we now must express by saying "he (or she, or it) was", exactly as Latin *erat*, etc. Two sentences which were at first independent units, were pronounced rapidly after each other and thereby came to be felt as a grammatical unit, i. e. one sentence, and this way of connecting thoughts continued in use after it had become customary in most sentences to have a pronoun as the subject (if no other subject was found), and when, therefore, such subjectless groups could be felt as dependent "clauses". Similarly in those cases in which the pronoun, if expressed, would have been an object. Such clauses without pronouns were particularly useful and easily understood when some substantive, etc., formed, as it were, a connecting link that could be joined equally well with the beginning and with the end of the whole.

Literature on the origin and early development of the "omission of the rel." is collected in Wülfing, *Syntax Alfr. des Großen* 1. 420. — It is sometimes believed that the construction was taken over from French, but that is out of the question, for the French constructions

are extremely rare and not quite analogous to the English ones. The latest collection of Fr examples is in Nyrop, *Gramm. hist. de la l. fr.* 5. 312. If foreign influence has to be thought of, it would be much more reasonable to think of Scandinavian: in Danish, contact-clauses are found from very early times (the oldest laws) and later become extremely frequent in nearly the same cases in which they occur in English; the development of these clauses presents many striking points of similarity in the two languages, so that in ninety out of a hundred cases where an Englishman can leave out the relative, a Dane would be able to do likewise, and vice versa; the kind mentioned in 7.1₂ has gone out of use in modern Danish, while it was common earlier. (On the omission see Hj. Falk og Alf Torp, *Dansk-norskens syntax*, 1900, p. 244ff., Kr. Mikkelsen, *Dansk ordføjningslære*, 1911, p. 718, 721). It is barely possible that these correspondences have developed independently in each language, but it seems far more probable that such clauses were already common in the spoken language of Scandinavian settlers in England, and that they influenced English.

**7.1₅.** Contact-clauses have probably been extremely common in everyday speech for at least six or seven hundred years. If they do not appear very frequently in the early ME texts, the reason may be sought in the character of these texts, which is far from being colloquial. Besides, writing was in those times slow and laborious, and the slower the mechanical process of writing, the less inducement would there be to use constructions which are characteristic of rapid and unconstrained speech. Moreover, many of our texts are translations from languages in which relative pronouns are always expressed in such clauses (Cf 7.1₆, 7.5₉ note).

**7.1₆.** In MnE contact-clauses continue in popular favour and perhaps even gain ground, except that those clauses in which the relative pronoun would have been the subject get more and more restricted to those classes which are mentioned below 7.5₃ff. Contact-clauses are found in great numbers in most of those writers whose style is natural and easy: Shakespeare, Swift, Fielding, Goldsmith, Sterne, Burke, Byron, Shelley, Carlyle, Dickens, Thackeray, Tennyson, Ruskin, Stevenson, to mention only some of the great dead. But in translations contact-clauses are very rare indeed. According to Shearin (*The That-Clause in the*

*Authorized Version of the Bible*, Lexington, Kentucky 1910) the only place in the Bible is Gen. 39.6 he knew not ought he had—apart from those places (8 in all) in which a subjunct *that* is omitted (e. g. Gen. 3.5 in the day ye eate thereof, then your eyes shal bee opened) and those doubtful cases in which *that* corresponds to mod. *what* and translates Gr. *ho*, Lat. *quod*: here we may hesitate whether to take *that* as demonstrative (then the clause is a contact-clause) or as relative without antecedent, cf above 3.7$_1$: that the former is the right view seems to be shown by the preposition in 2 Sam. 24.10 I haue sinned greatly in that I have done | John 1619 Doe ye enquire among your selues of that I saide. —Contact-clauses are further avoided by such writers as are strongly influenced by Latin syntax: in the whole of Milton's poetry there are probably less than ten examples (Lyc. 87, 126, PL X 545, 750, 752, XI 614, SA 227); Samuel Johnson called the omission of the relative "a colloquial barbarism" (though there are examples in his letters), and Macaulay deliberately avoids it; in one of his letters he blames Robertson for omitting the relative too often. According to Thum (ESt 4.304) there are only two examples of this construction in all the volumes of his History.

Let us now proceed to an illustration of the use of contact-clauses by means of examples, arranged according to the role that a relative pronoun, if expressed, would have filled in the clause.

**7.2$_1$.** The relative pronoun would have been the object; this is by far the most common case:

Ch A 620 Besyde a toun men clepen Baldeswelle | Ch B 847 Thanne is ther no comparison bitwene Thy wo and any wo man may sustene | ib 1053 at the firste look he on hire sette | Sh Err II 1.65 Where is the thousand markes I gaue thee, villaine? | ib II 2.1 The gold I gaue to Dromio is laid up | Walton A 89 to repent the money they spend | Defoe M 183 Here she set up the same trade she had followed in Ireland | Cowper L 1.210 the silence they are enjoined while I sit translating Homer | Shelley 634 The seed ye sow, an-

other reaps; The wealth ye find, another keeps; The robes ye weave, another wears; The arms ye forge, another bears | Kingsley H 335 all she required to make her perfect was conversion | Tenn. 257 In the songs I love to sing . . . then are these songs I sing of thee Not ungrateful to thine ears | Ru S 19 all the gold they could get was there | ib 91 I must repeat one thing I said in the last lecture | Seeley E 133 France is now burdened with a bankruptcy she will carry with her to the Revolution.

Thus also after *half* (as *half he possesses = half his possessions*): Defoe Rox 156 I would have given half I had in the world | Dryden 5.333 thou speak'st not half thou think'st | Hay B 198 when half a man says is false, the other half is apt to be also.

A special case is found when the relative would have been the object of a verbid in *ing* at the end of the clause:

Benson J 216 if you painted this picture, you would have to put something into it which I did not know, something you were afraid of my hearing | Lowell 312 'Twas a means self-defence only sanctioned his trying.

**7.2₂.** Contact-clauses are very frequent after the introductory *it is*, as "It is an apple he wants, not a pear". Cf also Hope D 67 How much was it he stole? || Di F 255 Who is that you stare after. A similar case is the frequent question: What is this I hear? (e. g. Bennett RS 229).

**7.2₃.** After *all* a contact-clause is frequent (some examples in 7.2₁): All he could do was to tell his mother | McKenna Sh 61 it was all you could do to keep from screaming.—But it would be awkward to leave out *that* in "he knows all that books can teach", because *all* and *books* would naturally be taken together.

**7.2₄.** Parallel to the direct object is the subject-part of a nexus-object: therefore we have frequent contact-clauses like these: one of the women he had made happy | one of the women he had made laugh | one of the women he had caused to laugh. A few literary examples (not quite so natural): Brontë V 94 if he roguishly encouraged aims he

never intended to be successful | ib 403 to effect all the director wished to be effected | Mackenzie C 232 It's a most extraordinary thing that the only person I don't want to laugh at me must do it. Cf 7.41.

**7.25.** Is it possible to leave out the pronoun that would be an indirect object? This question seems to have escaped the notice of grammarians. I am sorry to say that in my collection of slips with quotations I find only one bearing on it, viz. Galsw Ca 461 We're glad to sell drink to anyone we can, of course. I have submitted some made-up sentences to a few British scholars; they did not find fault with "This is the man we gave all those apples", nor with "It was Ann he had promised the ring, not Mary". I quote some of their comments. *This is the boy you promised the apple*: "I feel that this is quite possible, but in speaking colloquially many people would add *to* at the end. Careful speakers would, I think, say *whom you promised the apple*, or of course *to whom*".—*All the girls I have shown the pictures laughed at them* "quite possible".—*So this is the man we paid homage in our youth!*: "barely possible".—*The only man I told our secret was Bertram*; one friend writes: "sounds very unusual without *to*"; another: "O. K., though . . . *our secret to* is equally common, but I don't think more so". —The disinclination felt in many cases of this kind is connected with the fact that the indirect object is generally shown merely by its position between the verb and the direct object (or at any rate by its position after the verb, if the direct object is a relative or interrogative pronoun); any other position of the indirect object is therefore avoided, and *to* is generally added in "Whom did you promise the apples to"? and "the boys whom I promised the apples to" or "to whom I promised the apples". Similarly the bare *that* is felt nowadays as rather unnatural in Sh Wint II 1.94 shee's A bed-swaruer, euen as bad as those That vulgars giue bold'st titles. *To* is found, for instance, in Sh H5 IV 8.31 he that I gaue it to in change, promis'd to weare it in his cappe.

Burns 3.90 There's somebody there we'll teach better behaviour—is not an exception, if the personal object after *teach* is called direct, not indirect, see 14.9₆.

**7.2₆.** The relative pronoun would have been the object of a preposition; this is placed after the verb, generally at the very end of the clause:

Ch T 1.577 Ther is another thing I take of hede (the word-order now would be: take heed of) | Eastw 453 the poore tenement I told you off | Sh Ro I 4.104 This wind you talke of blowes vs from our selues | Swift 3.60 recompensed for all the charges he hath been at in making his defence | ib 100 a tone suitable to the condition I then was in | Goldsm V 2.38 this was a favour we wanted words to express our sense of | id 651 you should be the last man in the world I would apply to for assistance | Sheridan 323 they are the same kind I had the honour to furnish your lordship with in town | Keats 4.143 I bring with me a vexation they are better without | Shaw P 229 the robber now found himself in exactly the same position he had formerly forced me into | id Ms 55 Youre not the first I've said no to | McKenna SS 243 you won't convince the men he's already told the story to | Mrs Ward R 1.126 those nice people I stayed in Manchester with last year [unnatural word-order] | Galsw WM 100 attributed people's action not to . . . the leg they got out of bed with.

Note the combination of a verb with a preposition and one without: Otway 192 a deed the world shall gaze with wonder at, and envy when it is done (cf 8.5₂ and 10.2₆).

**7.3₁.** There is a certain disinclination to do without the relative pronoun after a personal pronoun, except in such obvious combinations as Dry 5.215 Give not her you love this pain | Hope Z 213 his evil eye flashed again at her I loved | Mered. H 216 on the face of her he loves.

In vulgar speech one finds Di D 457 she named no names, she said: let *them* the cap fitted, wear it.

**7.3₂.** The disinclination mentioned is evidently connected with the difficulty often experienced with regard to the

proper choice of the case form of the pronoun, which should be in the nominative in the main clause and in the objective in the relative clause. Shakespeare in such cases unhesitatingly uses the objective form: Cor. V 6.5 *Him* I accuse the city port by this hath enter'd | Ant. III 1.15 *him* we serues [serve is] away | Ro II 3.85 *her* I loue now Doth grace for grace, and loue for loue allow | As I 1.46 Know you before whom sir? I, better than *him* I am before knowes mee. The same case attraction is found now and then in recent times: Tennyson 370 Our noble Arthur, *him* Ye scarce can overpraise, will hear and know | Brontë V 141 *Him* you call the man is bourgeois | Shaw A 152 (vulgar speech) *Them* she lived with would have killed her.

It is easy to understand that relative attraction is not possible in cases like the following, in which we have accordingly the nominative form: Sh Ro I 1.212 and *shee*'s faire I loue | Swift UL 189 and *she* it was addressed to dyed some time ago.

**7.3₃.** Where we find an isolated *that* followed by a relative clause, it is often doubtful whether *that* is the relative (weakly stressed) or the demonstrative (strongly stressed), see II 16.355 and above 3.7₁. In the following quotations I take it that we have the demonstrative and a contact-clause:

Sh As II 5.26 but that they call complement is like th'encounter of two dog-apes | Ml F 30 to sound the deapth of that thou wilt professe | BJo 3.181 I met him even now, upon that he calls his delicate fine black horse | Defoe R 123 not one grain of that I sow'd this time came to any thing.—In all these *what* (or *that which*) would now be used.

Stevenson D 19 I was bound in a direction opposite to that you follow.

Cowper L 2.191 my song . . . if I liked the others as well as that I sent you, I would transcribe them.—Here, as well in the examples given II 16.325 of anaphoric *that* before a contact-clause, we should now say *that which*, or rather *the one* (*I sent you*, etc.). It would not be possible to

to say "a terror like that small animals feel on seeing a rattlesnake". Compare also the two constructions in Fielding 3.525 *the booty he met with* was not very considerable, tho' much greater than *that with which he acquainted Wild.*

**7.34.** There is, however, one combination in which a contact-clause is still natural after the demonstrative *that*, namely after *what is*: Swift PC 69 What lady was that you were talking with in the side-box? | Austen P 216 What is that you are saying, FitzWilliam? what is it you are talking of? (note the different stress [hwɔts ˈðæt . . . hwɔt ˈiz it]) Di Do 69 what is that mamma did? | ib 238 What was that you said?

**7.35.** Even after adjunct *that* a contact-clause is not very frequent nowadays: *which* is preferred in sentences like this: it belongs to that kind of evidence which we term circumstantial. Cp Butler ER 128 our two lives—namely, *the one we live* in our own persons, and *that other life which* we live in other people.—See, however Sheridan 361 rouse up that spirit a woman ought to bear | Austen P 149 many returns of that delightful intercourse we have known | Brontë V 69 with that absorbed air and brow of hard thought she sometimes wore (also ib 89).

**7.36.** But after *those* there is no objection to contact-clauses: Mill Lib 80 instead of seeking contrivances for this purpose, they have lost those they formerly had | Goldsm V 1.130 Conscience is a coward, and those faults it has not strength enough to prevent, it seldom has justice enough to punish by accusing | Mrs Ward above 7.26: those nice people I stayed with.

**7.41.** Is it possible to have contact-clauses in which the relative, if expressed, would have been in the nominative? Here we must first deal separately with two combinations in which it is true that we should have the nominative according to traditional syntax, but in which it is rather the oblique case that popular speech instinct would supply.

First in the predicative: as *it is me*, not *it is I*, is the popular form, we may perhaps say that sentences like the

following, which are very frequent, should be placed with those in 7.2:

Wordsw 402 And be in heart and soul the same She was before she hither came | Di X 66 I am not the man I was (cf ib 21 for the love of him you once were) | Wells PF 7 I want to write my story not indeed to the child you are now, but to the man you are going to be | Brontë V 415 she was not the mere child or elf my Polly seems to me | Bennett RS 286 he was not the god-like little being he thought he was.

Contact-clauses are particularly frequent after *like*, as in: Scott Iv. 277 I would not descend to it like the beast I have lived | Di Do 161 like the hard-hearted little midshipman he was (ib 9 and 385) | GE Mm 225 Like the eccentric woman she was, she was at present absorbed in considering . . . | Hope R 111 like the irresolute man he was | id Z 212 Michael will fall, like the dog he is.

The pronoun would have been the predicative of a nexus object: Lytton K 95 I am not the madman you thought me | Walp Cp 284 You were never the girl I thought you.

In the following quotations we have a relative instead of an interrogative clause as in 3.8s: Di H 81 he thought of the different man he might have been | Tarkington MA 79 how utterly she failed to comprehend the kind of person he was.

**7.42.** The construction with an adjective predicative as in Zangwill G 329 "it's married you are going to be" is not very frequent in ordinary English, but is quite an idiom in Irish English: "it is surprised you will be", etc., thus frequently in Synge's plays and Birmingham's novels.

**7.43.** Second, we have the peculiar kind of concatenated sentence in which the pronoun if expressed might be taken partly as a kind of object of an inserted verb (*think*, etc.), partly as the subject of the following verb. I have discussed these clauses in PG 349ff. and tried to show that the popular feeling is in favour of the former analysis, as shown by the frequency of the form *whom* and of contact-clauses. Here I shall reprint only some of the examples there given, but add

some new ones: Sh Gent II 4.87 This is the gentleman I told your ladiship Had come along with me | BJo A Prol 21 They shall find things, they'ld thinke, or wish, were done | Defoe Rox 240 husbands love to enquire after anything they think is kept from them | id M 133 that I had a mother I believed was alive there still | Keats 4.188 I did not like to write before him a letter he knew was to reach your hands | Lytton K 83 The last thing I thought could befall me was that I should have any trouble | London A 50 puzzled over something untoward he was sure had happened | Lawrence L 193 she's just the type I always knew would attract him | Marshall Sorry Scheme 273 Platonic friendship was the gun you didn't know was loaded | Williamson Wedd. D. 77 it's clear that in manners and everything else you would think makes a man, he's as much above me as he feels | Masterman WL 93 I should fake up a charge against a man I knew was not guilty. Cf 11.7$_3$.

**7.5**$_1$. Now we come to those cases in which the relative pronoun would certainly have been in the nominative, namely when it is undoubtedly the subject of the clause. Here contact-clauses were formerly frequent in combinations where they have since gone out of use,cf 7.1$_2$ and see Lag1.146 Leir þe king wende forh to is dohter wunede norð (MS.B inserts *þat*). A typical example, in which the *apo koinou* analysis can be applied, is Sh Tw II 4.110 My father had a daughter lou'd a man. Other examples:

Malory 137 lete fetche the best hors maye be founde | Marl E 1712 haue you proclaimed, my lord, Reward for them can bring in Mortimer? | Sh Err III 2.186 I see a man here needs not liue by shifts | Sh Wint V 1.23 you are one of those Would haue him wed againe | Otway 238 to doe a deed shall chronicle thy name | 249 I've done a deed will make my story quoted | 259 I'm the wretchedst creature E'r crawl'd on earth | Dryden 5.327 I bring him news will raise his drooping spirits | Spect 10 you are the first ever asked who he was | Swift P 59 I am not the first man has carry'd a rod to whip himself | Sheridan 218 this is one of your peerless

beauties, I suppose, has dropped in by chance | Burns 1.281 or like the snow falls in the river | 1.283 A garter which a babe had strangled, A knife a father's throat had mangled.

In most of these quotations the sense is unmistakable; but in other cases the construction was apt to lead to obscurity, as in Sh Gent IV 4.78 *She* lou'd me well, deliuer'd it to me [= she who] | Gammer 111 what shuld he haue, again thy nee[d]le got? | B Jo 3.10 and they are envious term thee parasite | 3.180 wilt thou ascribe that to merit now, was mere fortune? | 3.191 what did you bring me, should make you thus peremptory? (B Jo is very fond of this construction).

**7.52.** Nowadays the construction is only found as a vulgarism or as an archaism in poets: Thack H 94 to help the kindest master and missus ever was | By DJ 1.136 when at her door Arose a clatter might awake the dead | Keats 2. 138 I will advance a terrible right arm Shall scare that infant thunderer, rebel Jove | Mrs. Browning A 30 as if the worst, could happen, was to rest | Bridges E 151 refusing all is offered.

There are several examples in McKenna SS (59, 61, 164), but as they are all put in the mouth of an Irishman, they are probably meant by the author as dialectal.

**7.53.** In standard speech there are nowadays only certain well-defined instances in which the relative pronoun as a subject can be dispensed with. In the first place we must mention sentences beginning with a more or less superfluous or meaningless introductory phrase like *it is*, *there is* (*are*), *here is* (*are*). Here it is particularly easy to take the substantive (or other primary word) as immediately connected with the following verb as its subject ('apo koinou').

Examples with *it is*: Bacon A 8.6 It is a kinde of miracle hath brought us hither | Lyly C 321 It is your heart is on fire, not your shop | Sh Shr II 1.344 'Tis deeds must win the prize | Proverb, in Swift P 56 and Congreve 276 it is an ill wind blows nobody good (now generally . . . that . . .) | Dryden 5.396 'tis thy design brought all this ruin on us |

Swift P 69 'tis only fools cut their fingers | Fielding T 4.152 it was Landlord recommended them | Sheridan 204 'tis this reflection gives me assurance | ib 249 'twas Mr Surface brought Sir Peter | GE Mm 100 it's you must explain | Kipl J 2.149 it was haste killed the yellow snake | Wells H 24 It was that made her novelty . . . so dominating | Thurston Antag. 43 It isn't every boy gets an open chance like this.

A contact-clause after another relative clause is found in Sh Ant IV 3.16 'Tis the God Hercules, whom Anthony loued, Now leaves him.

It is worth noting that in this position the feeling that a pronoun belongs to the following verb (as subject) even more than to the preceding one (as predicative), protects it from being put in the objective case, as in the unsophisticated *it's me*: Sheridan 233 'twasn't I let him in | Thack V 178 It was he had brought back George | Wells L 296 It's I have been stupid | Stevenson B 146 It is I have led you hither | Hardy L 143 'Tis I have sent them.

**7.54.** With a different word-order, especially after an interrogatory pronoun, the *apo koinou* feeling is excluded: Defoe Rox 170 eager to know who it was danced with me | Fielding 3.432 see who it is lives in the most magnificent buildings | Goldsm. 619 who was it first made him an acquaintance to Lady S's rout? | Thack V 103 What was it set one to watch the other so? | ib 285 It is hard to say which pang it was tore the proud father's heart most keenly | Ward R 1.16 But what is it makes the poor old thing so excited | ib 2.32 do you know what it was struck me most? | Wilde S 81 I wonder who it was defined man as a rational animal || Wells T 35 and there whatever it was did happen had taken place || id WW 137 This it was had caused the regular beating noise | 143 and that familiar sound it was made me listen | id U 354 She it is arrests my attention first.

**7.55.** Contact-clauses after *that is*:

Zangwill G 178 That was Cantercot just went in, wasn't it? | Hardy R 149 that's all is the matter with me | Ward

R 3.90 Was that some one brought you a note? | Bennett LM 112 that's a thing might happen to any man.

**7.56.** Examples abound after *there is*, *there are*: Ch A 594 Ther was noon auditour coude on him winne | ib 3932 There was no man, for peril, dorste hym touche | Caxton R 92 yf ther be any can saye and make good | Sh H 4 IV 1.148 there are few dye well, that dye in a battaile | Mcb II 2.24 There's one did laugh in's sleepe | Bacon A 33.20 ther was never any army had their men stand in better battell-array | Defoe G 54 there's scarce one in five of them can speake good English | Swift P 99 there's a man below wants to speak to you | Fielding T 4.25 there are very surprising things happen in this world | Sterne 15 there is a fatality attends the actions of some men | Sheridan 246 there are very few would credit what I have done | Goldsm 631 there is old Croaker has just picked it up | By D J 1.123 'Tis sweet to know there is an eye will mark Our coming, and look brighter when we come | Carlyle S 166 for there is a devil dwells in man | Thack. V 288 which of us is there can tell | Di D 704 there's Copperfield, would have given you a hundred pound | Mered. H 29 there's nothing vexes me so much | ib 94 there's a gentleman in the shop wants to see you (ib 179, 207) | Kipl J 2.121 there was a down-country jackall had it from a brother | ib 2.214 there is no striped one would dare kill here | Wilde W 29 there are lots of vulgar people live in Grosvenor Square | Shaw C 220 there isn't a boy in your stables would give me up like that | Galsw Ca 1 There was Danson died the other day.

Cp also *there* with another verb Sh Merch II 5.42 There will come a Christian by, Will be worth a Jewes eye.—Without *there*, but otherwise analogous: Sh R3 II 2.78 Was neuer widdow had so deere a losse (and the following lines).

**7.57.** After *here is* the construction is not quite so frequent as after *there is*:

Sheridan 215 here are three or four of us pass our time agreeably enough | ib 223 here's little Premium will buy all my ancestors | ib 224 here's an old gouty chair of my grand-

father's will answer the purpose | Di D 214 here's Mr. Maldon begs the favour of a word | ib 224 here's Dr. Strong has positively been and made you the subject of a handsome declaration (ib 405, 477).

After *where is* I have only two quotations:

Malory 146 where is the lady shold mete vs here | Sh LLL IV 3.312 For where is any author in the world, Teaches such beauty as a womans eye.

**7.5₈.** As *we have* etc., is often synonymous with *there is*, it should not surprise us that the same construction is sometimes found after sentences containing *have*:

Gammer 114 who haue we there maketh such a din? Here is a good fellow, maketh no great daunger | Sh Ado I 1.18 He hath an vncle heere in Messina, wil be very much glad of it | id Meas II 2.35 I haue a brother is condemn'd to die | Swift 3.282 I had several men died in my ship | Defoe R 2.37 they had a sloop lay in a small creek | Scott Iv 140 thou shalt have that will make thee quiet for life.—Cp also Sher 342 his lordship has given me a pill has purged off all my scruples.

**7.5₉.** A further case in which it is possible to do without a relative pronoun that would have been the subject, is when the relative clause begins with *there* (*is*). It should be noted that here the verb is not the first word of the clause, and that there is thus some analogy with the ordinary type of contact-clauses (see 7.2); it may also be doubtful whether *no man* in *there is no man* stands to the popular speech instinct in exactly the same relation as an ordinary subject. It is interesting to note that in Danish, where unmarked relative clauses abound in very much the same cases as in English, this kind of sentence with *der*, which was originally the adverb of place like E. *there* and was frequently weakened, has developed in such a way that *der* (with weak stress and indistinct vowel) has become a regular relative pronoun in the nominative, see especially C. F. Bruun, *En sproglig undersøgelse* (Horsens 1877). It would not be far wrong to

say that E. *there* in the following sentences has approximately the value of a relative pronoun.

Examples (I have none before the 18th century): Defoe M 94 I relate this story the more particularly because of the good-humour there was in it | Mary Shelley F 205 the agonies of remorse poison the luxury there is otherwise sometimes found in indulging the excess of grief | Carlyle F 34 as if I could write a better book than any there has been in this country for generations | id R 1.237 he had infinite delight in a little baby toy there was | ib 2.187 the only free room there was |id H 138 after all the talk there is and has been about it | Di Do 402 the confidence there has been between us must be broken off | Wells L 150 thinking of the chances there were against him in the battle of the world | Mered H 52 the holiness there is in death | Swinb L 176 she is between shadow and sun, in the dampest place there is | ib 269 Two days here have put me up to the work there is to do | Bennett H 9 money is just about the commonest thing there is (ib 11) | Wilde W 9 she taught me the difference there is between what is right and what is wrong | Wells TM 116 But any cartridges or powder there may once have been had rotted into dust | Galsw P 4.45 I've told you all there is to tell | London M 110 becoming familiar with all there was to know | O. Henry C 84 that was all there was doing.

It is worth remarking that all the cases in which the relative subject can be omitted in present-day natural speech have this in common that there is some more or less meaningless existential phrase either preceding the clause (it is . . ., there are . . .) or in it (. . . there is).

P. Fijn van Draat has a long article on "The Omission of the Nominative Relative" (in prose) in *Anglia* 36. 493 ff. with many valuable quotations. The article, however, is vitiated by his pet theory of the influence of rhythm, which to him is all-important, and likewise by his peculiar ideas of the influence of literature on everyday speech. He thinks that although Chaucer's poetry abounds with examples, the omission had not yet become part and parcel of the language — why not? Because there is only one instance in *Melibeus*. He does not see, that

the phenomenon is one of decidedly popular growth, something which writers use in their everyday speech and will therefore unconsciously introduce in their works when the flow of their thought is natural, but not when they are writing, as Chaucer was in Mel., with a foreign text under their eyes, in which no relative pronouns are ever suppressed. This naturally accounts for the non-occurrence or rarity of our phenomenon in many texts mentioned by Fijn van Draat: Wycliffe's Bible, Caxton's Foure Sonnes of Aymon, Florio's Montaigne, and the AV of the Bible. I cannot agree with van Draat when he thinks that "it was Shakespeare who made it (the omission) an integral part of the language"—nor with his assertions that when Sheridan omits the relative, it was because as an actor he was struck with the omission in the plays of Bickerstaff, Rowe, and other second-rate dramatists, though he failed to see their rhythm, and that Dickens used the construction so frequently because he had drawn his inspiration from the novelists of the 18th century and from the drama of the 17th and 18th centuries, which is said to be shown by his rhythmic use of the construction. When Dickens writes: "Here's somebody wants to see you", van Draat thinks that he stresses the middle syllable of *somebody*! It is sometimes funny to see our writer's preoccupation with rhythm: when English authors omit the relative without producing a rhythm that is pleasing to van Draat's ear, he qualifies the omission as "a meaningless trick". All this to my mind shows a totally wrong conception of the way in which syntactical habits of this kind come into existence. It is also, I think, a double mistake to investigate the omission in prose only: in many ways poetry shows the natural tendencies of speech just as well as or even better than prose, which in former centuries was often stilted and pedantic under the influence of Latin syntax: witness the aversion of Johnson and Macaulay to contact-clauses. It is, perhaps, worthy of note that Swift, in whose *Gulliver* van Draat has found no examples of the nominative omitted, has some in his *Polite Conversation*.

**7.61.** Next we come to those cases in which the relative pronoun, if it had been expressed, would have been a subjunct (very often a preposition would have been required). This very often serves to indicate a time-relation:

Ch T 4.1656 I never unto Criseyde, *Sin thilke day* I saw hir first with ye, Was fals | (Ch C 439 trowe ye, *the whyles* I may preche . . . That I wol live in povert wilfully ?) | Sh As III 2.243 Looks he as freshly as he did *the day* he wrastled ? | BJo A 1.496 This is *the day*, I am to perfect for him The magisterium | AV (above 7.16) *in the day* ye eate

thereof | Defoe M 93 I had given it her *the same night* she talked so foolishly | Fielding 3.82 he put on the softest look imaginable, *the moment* he approached me | Cowper L 2.160 *The moment* he entered the room, I felt myself incurably prejudiced against him . . . All this I related at the Hall *the next time* we dined there | Carlyle FR 445 ready to begin *the instant* the ground were clear | Shaw Ms 26 I want to forget myself from *the moment* I go in to *the moment* I come out | Stev T 44 *By the time* I had told mother of my purpose they were all in the saddle | Kennedy CN 79 Think what a to-do there was *last time* we did | Dreiser F 67 The siege having ended *the same day* it began.

Here *the whiles*, *the moment*, etc., may be said to fulfil the same function as a conjunction, and indeed with the article omitted, *while* (*whiles* = *whilst*) passes entirely into that class of words. We are here reminded of the transition into a conjunction of such words as *now*, *directly*, *once* (Now he is married, he has forgotten his former life | directly he entered the room, everybody became silent | once you come to think of it, etc.

The modern disinclination to use a contact-clause after *that* mentioned above (7.3₅) leads to the distinction between *About the time he started* (= when he started) and *About that time he started* (= then he started).

**7.6₂.** The subjunct serves to indicate manner, etc.

Sh H 8 III 2.435 Had I but seru'd my God *with halfe the zeale* I seru'd my King | B Jo 3.171 every pleasure must be bought anew, and *with the same pain and charge* you wooed her at first | Walton A 50 I wil do it, and *with all the speed* I can | Swift 3.5 *in the posture* I lay, [I] could see nothing except the sky | Spect 780 *in the temper of mind* he was then, he termed them mercies | Goldsm V 1.37 The night was concluded *in the manner* we began the morning | Tenn 294 I know *the way* she went Home with her maiden posy | Brontë V 146 I could not estimate the admiration *at the same rate* he did | Hope D 33 Dolly was looking up at Archie *in the way* they do, you know | Barrie MO 38 *the reason* my books deal with the past is simply this . . . | Williamson S 18 that's *one reason* he likes to come.

Cp Sheridan 306 may he now defend his country's laws *with half the spirit* he has broke them all!

**7.71.** In recent times we find the adverbs of place *anywhere* and *everywhere* with contact-clauses meaning the same thing as and to some extent replacing *wherever*. This should be compared with the use of an adjective adjunct with such adverbs (1.19), see also 8.65 on *that* in such cases.

Opinions seem to be divided with regard to this usage: one English professor, whom I asked about the sentence "she behaved like that everywhere (anywhere) she went", pronounced it "quite good", while another said, "horrid; loose English anyhow". I shall therefore give a good many examples, though not all those I have collected:

Thack N 551 he would live with his grandmother anywhere she liked | Di D 281 I'll come anywhere you like or do anything you like | Kipl J 1.153 he could scratch himself anywhere he pleased | Shaw D 59 sit down—anywhere you can | Wells A 136 the general freedom of people to live anywhere they like over large areas | Twain H 1.68 I can stop anywhere I want to | Herrick M 225 refusing to go almost anywhere she would be likely to meet people she knew | Mackenzie C 389 it's nice here. Nicer than anywhere we've walked, I think.

Locke S 240 Everywhere he goes he finds them . . . Wherever Rattenden turned a bit of gossip met his ear | Caine C 433 Has anybody looked for her? I have—everywhere—everywhere I can think of | Wells Fm 85 but everywhere one looked spread the tumbled rocks | id War and Fut 70 I found thoughtful men talking everywhere I have been in Italy of two things | Williamson L 241 Everywhere you looked was a new picture | ib 261 if she hadn't held a sort of salon everywhere we've been | Walpole C 501 Everywhere I go, there they are, following me.

This evidently began with cases like the first examples, in which the added clauses with the verb *like* or *please* is really pleonastic, and was later extended to other verbs.

Two other compounds with *any* are used (less idiomatically) in the same way in Stevenson M 5 Anyway the wind was, it was always sea air | Ru F 22 help any one, anyhow you can.

Somewhat different is *nowhere* in Wells A 207 there is nowhere they can come in, there is nothing they can do | Maugham TL 258 There's nowhere she can go. Here it would be more usual to repeat *where*; cf Kipl S 255 Let's go somewhere where it's clean.

### Final Remarks on Contact-clauses.

**7.8.** This survey of actual usage on every point confirms Curme's judgment (CG 177) that "this favorite old construction . . . is a good natural English expression, not a mutilated grammatical member, but . . . performing its function tersely, yet clearly and forcefully, often even with elegant simplicity".

It is true (or at any rate highly probable) that our idiom has arisen out of parataxis, i. e. the loose pronouncing after one another of two independent sentences, possibly with a pause between them, but this has now been completely changed, and we may even say that though there is no connecting word, the two parts of the sentence are more intimately joined together than when the relative pronouns *who* or *which* are used: indeed it is among the relative clauses of the latter kind that we find what have here been termed loose relative clauses. Before contact-clauses we have never a pause; the intonation too, of the whole sentence, the clause included, shows unity and is different from that of two independent sentences.

As the idiom is used now in colloquial speech and by good writers, it is perfectly clear, and it must be reckoned a gain to the language that it has discarded some of the old liberty of clauses in which the relative pronoun would have been the subject (7.5$_1$). Some of the old examples are not easily understood at the first blush, and the same is

true of some sentences in which later poets imitate old constructions, e. g. Browning 1.582 Was I, [whom] the world arraigned, Were they, [whom] my soul disdained, Right? | ib 583 He fixed thee mid this dance Of plastic circumstance, This Present, [which] thou forsooth, wouldst fain arrest— we find even harsher sentences here and there in Browning.

When we hear a sentence beginning "The ring you gave me" we naturally expect something to follow and thus take *you gave me* as a relative clause, because it is unusual, though not exactly impossible, to place the object of *you gave* at the beginning and thus to make the whole into a complete sentence. In Danish, on the other hand, where it is much more usual to have front-position of an object, a distinction is made by means of the place of the verb; "Ringen gav du mig" | "Ringen du gav mig (er blevet borte)".

Though I quote with approval Curme's appreciation of what he terms asyndetic relative clauses, I must criticize his grammatical views, when he says that in "Here is the book you lent me" *the* is a connective which binds the clause to the principal proposition (but what about "There are people he dislikes" in which, at any rate, there is no such connective?)—or when he says that there is often a personal pronoun suppressed, e. g. in "This is the pen I write with [it]"—or finally when he puts "I lent Mrs. Jones what butter there was in the house" on a par with "My children have had every complaint there is to be had", as if we had a contact-clause after *what* and as if *what* was not in itself relative pronoun enough.

---

## Chapter VIII.

## Relative that.

**8.11.** It has been said above (4.31f.) that in the middle English period and in the beginning of the modern period *that* was the usual relative word, but that its sphere of use has since then been narrowed through the encroachments of the *wh*-pronouns, especially in the literary language.

Nowadays *that* is used very seldom indeed in non-restrictive clauses, and even in restrictive clauses there is a strong tendency to use *who* and not *that* in reference to persons, and a less strong tendency to use *which* in reference to things.

**8.12.** Examples of the old use of *that* in decidedly non-restrictive clauses: Ch B 1142 Deeth, that taketh of heigh and logh his rente | Sh Mcb III 1.135 Fleans, his sonne, that keepes him companie | Gent II 4.174 my foolish riuall, that her father likes (Onely for his possessions are so huge) is gone with her | Hml I 1.31 your eares, That are so fortified against our story | ib I 1.150 the cocke that is the trumpet to the day | Mi C 662 as Daphne was, Root-bound, that fled Apollo | Fielding T 2.50 my only child, my poor Sophy, that was the joy of my heart | Cf 5.18.

**8.13.** The use of *that* after antecedents denoting persons, though, as remarked already, less usual than formerly, cannot be termed obsolete: see, e. g., two recent quotations: in the second *that* may have been chosen for variety's sake:

Kipl L 72 Who's the man that says that we're all islands shouting lies to each other across seas of misunderstanding ? | Russell Ed 126. The child who has been treated wisely and kindly has a frank look in the eyes, whereas the child that has been subject to nagging or severity is in perpetual terror of incurring reproof.

Other recent examples of *that* after a personal antecedent may be found in the quotations in 4.61 Shaw, 4.62 Buchan, 4.63 Shaw, Bennett, Galsw, Swinnerton, 4.65 Doyle, 4.66 Dickinson, Benson, Locke, 4.81 Stevenson, 4.85 Hope, 4.91 Walpole, McKenna, 4.92 Maugham, Maxwell, 5.13 Bridges, 5.15 Maugham, 5.18 Maxwell, Shaw, 5.19 Mackenzie, Merrick, 5.21 Phillpotts.

**8.14.** One of the reasons for this decline of *that* after words denoting persons is that people are now more influenced by the sight of the written form and thus think that *that* is a neuter, because it is spelt in the same way as the strongly stressed demonstrative pronoun [ðæt]. In some

cases the use of *who* serves to avoid ambiguity, thus often after *all* (4.81): though no doubt is possible where the form shows the number (*all that is found* is neuter, and *all that are found* is personal) there is a gain in clearness if we say *all who might be found*, if 'everybody' is meant, and restricting *all that might be found* to the meaning 'everything'. See also the remark 5.15 on *those that* and *those who*.

Fowler, MEU 716, says: "At present there is much more reluctance to apply *that* to a person than to a thing. Politeness plays a great part in idiom, and to write *The ladies that were present*, or *The general that most distinguished himself*, is perhaps felt to be a sort of slight, depriving them of their humanity . . . Expressions in which we may prefer *that* without being suspected of pedantry are: *The most impartial critic that could be found* | *The only man that I know of* | *Anyone that knows anything knows this* | *It was you that said so* | *Who is it that talks about moral geography?* To increase by degrees the range of *that* referring to persons is a worthy object for the reformer of idiom, but violent attempts are doomed to failure". (Compare his former remark KE 83: *that* referring to persons has "come to look archaic" except after a superlative or similar word).

**8.15.** Sweet § 2141 has the example: "then the children were lifted out by the mother; and then the nurse, an awkward, plain girl that nobody helped, tumbled out by herself". He explains this by saying that the omission of the relative would lead to obscurity or awkwardness, and that on the other hand speakers would here avoid the accusative *who*, which they have been taught to look upon as 'ungrammatical'. *Whom* evidently would be bookish. It might however be said that the clause is just as much a part of the characterization as the adjectives, and therefore really restrictive in regard to the substantive *girl*. A similar example is Shaw A 190 your duchess is only a flower girl that you taught. Sweet's explanation probably accounts for *that* in Shaw C 7 (a schoolboy speaking:) Tatham, that the doctor thinks such as genius, does all his constering [i.e. construing] from

cribs—but it does not assist us in ib 161 Lord Worthington, that comes to see you when he likes.—

In McKenna SS 84 "Even Oxford, that I thought could never alter, had changed during my absence", the reason for the use of *that* probably is that *who* would be felt as too personal, and on the other hand *which* as too impersonal.

**8.16.** *Who* is not used as a predicative; the reason seems to be that the predicative is felt as a neuter (see PG 242f. and 6.44). Hence we find *that* in some cases mentioned above under the *same that* 4.92 and in

Kennedy CN 201 He remembered her suddenly as the defenceless creature that she had been when last they were all together | ib 243 remembering the tolerant, unsuspicious creature that she used to be | Locke GP 195 he would have revealed himself as the man that he really was | ib 255 Nothing about her to betray the woman that he had long since known her to be [De Quincey 337 Like the sensible girl that we have always found her]. Note the neutral *all* in Shaw Ms 96 I am all that a woman ought to be.

**8.17.** *That* is also predicative in constructions like the following, in which the clause is added to a word in apposition to some other word:

Ch T 3.1565 never the bet for yow, *Fox that ye been*, god yeve your herte care! Bunyan P 51 but that, *wretched man that I am*! I slept | ib 211 alas for them, *poor men that they are!* | Gay BP 63 Did I let him escape, (*Fool that I was!*) to go to her? | Di F 274 Good! cries Twemlow, *polite little gentleman that he is* | Di X 209 The Carrier was in high spirits, *good fellow that he was* | Hardy L 100 Mrs Harnham—lonely *impressionable creature that she was* | Gosse F 301 he really allowed her, *grim vixen that she was*, to disturb his plans | Bennett A 69 a lot of you, *fools that you are*, have come here to hear me | Hawth T 128 But Philemon, simple and *kind-hearted old man that he was*, had not many secrets | Shaw P 255 you recovered the estate easily enough then, *robber and rascal that you are.*

**8.18.** Very often similar combinations are used in isolated exclamations, where the substantive thus is not in

apposition to anything: BJo 1.90 *Beast that I was*, to trust him! | Tenn 295 *Fool that I am* to be vext with his pride! | Di D 672 Ha, ha! *The liars that these traders are!* | Kingsley H 252 Unthinking *fool that I was!* | Hardy L 46 O the fool, *the fool that I was!* | Shaw P 225 *Thoughtful man that you are*, Mr. R.!

These exclamations may be compared with those in 17.8s.

**8.19.** After an adjective, *as* is generally used in such appositional additions and exclamations (see below 9.41). Exceptional *that* in Sh Gent V. 4.28 O miserable, vnhappy that I am | Kingsley H 42 Foolish that I am! *That* is repeated by *as* in Di Do 246 who takes me, refuse that I am, and as I well deserve to be.

**8.21.** There is an interesting idiom in which it is customary to use *that*, although the clause, which contains nothing but a form of the verb *be*, is often non-restrictive and may refer to a person; it serves no other purpose than that of indicating the time relation (what in some American languages is indicated by a tense-inflexion of the substantive itself). We see this in the standing phrase with the obsolete form *be*: *the powers that be*; further Spenser FQ V. 4 Right now is wrong, and *wrong that was* is right | Swift UL 14 Do you mean *Lady Jenny Forbes that was?* | Defoe R 2.212 my partner oblig'd the *prior that then was*, to go to the Monastery | Goldsm V 2.219 *Lady Thornhill* (*that was to be*) should take the lead | Di Do 274 *Mrs Dombey that is to be*, will be very sensible of your attention | Carlyle F 3.95 I call *each chapter that was*, a book, and have subdivided all these into chapters [= each division that was [called] a chapter] | id R 2.181 The last paragraph [of FR] I well remember writing upstairs in *the drawing-room that now is*, which was then my writing-room | ib. 1.282 Somewhere near *the Admiralty* (*that now is, and perhaps then was*) | Holmes A 317 three [trees] blew down in *my woods* (*that were*) in 1852 | Hardy R 54 *my wife that is now*, went . . . | Swinb L 92 people began to talk of her as *Lady Cheyne that was to be* | Lang T 18 So much of *the poet that was to be* existed in the little volume of the undergraduate.

*Who* is here exceptional as in Mrs. Browning A 125 She has sent me to find *a cousin of mine who shall be* (i. e. someone who is to marry my cousin).

In vulgar speech we have *as* (cf 9.3): Bennett RS 190 He married Mrs. Arb, as was.

**8.2₂.** An interesting variant is found in combinations like *Mrs. Harrison, Miss Brown that was* or *Miss Brown, Mrs. Harrison that is to be;* here the substantive placed in apposition and followed by the relative clause, might be apprehended as the predicative of the following verb, but if we transcribe the combination so as to show this, *who* would be used rather than *that:* Mrs. Harrison, who was Miss B., the clause being then clearly non-restrictive. Exactly the same construction is found in Spanish: don N, cónsul que fué de España (Hanssen, Span. grammatik § 54,3 and 39,3). English examples (note *who* in the second clause in the Thackeray quotation):

Gamelyn 38 fergetith nat Gamelyn, *my zonge sone that is* | Sh Merch II 2.90 I am Lancelet *your boy that was, your sonne that is, your childe that shall be* (cf also R 2 V. 2.41) | Peacock M 166 Next to him is Miss Crotchet, *my sister in law that is to be* | Quincey 94 I therefore, *Deucalion that was or had been* provisionally | Thack N 618 Clive's acquaintance, *Mr. Belsize that was, Lord Highgate who is now* | Herrick T 71 Saw your friend *Miss Pallanton that was*—Mrs. Woodyard—at the Stantons'.

*Who* is exceptional: Walpole C 431 Miss Milton, *librarian who was*, had obtained this letter.

**8.3₁.** The relative *that* is nowadays generally avoided after the demonstrative *that* (though there seems to be no objection to the combination of weak *that* followed by the demonstrative, as in "I maintain that that view is wrong | anything that that lady does looks pretty." Addison's ridicule of the sequence of many *that*'s was quoted above (4.3₂). The following examples show the use of authors who are not afraid of this collocation:

Fulg 22 by that that ye say ye force not what myne ans-

were be | More U 192 in that that nature doth allure | Sh Gent IV 2.87 Who is that that spake? | As I 2.80 if you sweare by that that is not, you are not forsworn | Wiv I 1.218 I shall doe that that is reason | ib II 2.216 Pursuing that that flies, and flying what pursues | Walton A 65 sing us a song, that that was sung by you and your daughter, when I last past | Bunyan P 4 a little of that that I am seeking to enjoy.

The pronouns now used instead of *that that* are *what*, *that which*, or (when a concrete thing is meant, as in the example from Walton) *the one that* or *the one which*.

**8.3₂.** However, *that that* is tolerated after *it is* (cf 4.6): Hope D 52 it's just that that makes stories like yours so infernally uninteresting | id Z 171 it's not only that, sir, that keeps him away | Stevenson M 282 it was partly that that brought me down | Doyle S 6.233 it's that that turns my soul into water | Merriman S 146 It is that particular point which gives me trouble. It is that that I wish to discover.

**8.3₃.** Even after the demonstrative adjunct *that* a relative *that* is rare, as in

Congreve 251 do you mean that fair-weather spark that was here just now? | Johnson in Bosw. 1.130 if it can be made probable, that that union that has received the divine approbation shall continue | Wells TM 53 Under the new conditions of perfect security, that restless energy, that with us is strength, would become weakness | Walp RH 169 to preserve that life that but now he had thought to throw away.

Most writers prefer *that . . . which*.

Here, however, the reason for the reluctance to use *that* is not (or at any rate not exclusively) the same as in the case of the neuter primary *that*, but rather the demonstrative force of *that*, which makes the relative clause less decidedly restrictive and thus favours the use of the *wh*-pronouns. This appears on the one hand from the similar disinclination to contact-clauses in this case (see 7.3₅), on the other hand from the preference of *who* and *which* after the plural adjunct *those*, where euphony can play no part: while *that* is common

after the primary *those* (5.15), it is rarer after the adjunct, as in Di O 422 those joyous little faces that clustered round her knee.

**8.41.** A relative *that*-clause is sometimes found after *so* and *such*, where nowadays a clause of consequence with *that* and a following personal pronoun would be preferred: Sh Lucr 854 no perfection is so absolute, That some impuritie doth not pollute | Hml III 4.41 Such an act That blurres the grace and blush of modestie | Cæs I 2.316 For who so firme, that cannot be seduc'd? | ib III 2.30 Who is heere so base that would be a bondsman? Who is heere so rude that would not be a Roman? Who is heere so vile that will not loue his country? | Mi A 28 Who is so unread or so uncatechis'd in story, that hath not heard . . .

Cp. also Carlyle H 138 Who are you that presume to school the nobles? (= that you, since you).—*Which* used similarly: Swift 3. 237 there is nothing so extravagant and irrational which some philosophers have not maintained for truth.

**8.42.** *That* is always used in *that I know* and similar expressions after a negative = 'so far as I know'. *That* is here pronounced [ðət] and must be considered as the relative word; but it is worth noting that in similar expressions in Danish either *det* (demonstrative pronoun) or more popularly *at* (conjunction) is used: "ikke det jeg veed | ikke at jeg har hørt". Examples (the oldest in NED is from 1460): Ch B 1021 fader hath he noon, *That I of wot* | B Jo 3.35 He was a kinsman to you? *That I know of* | Bunyan G 12 I felt what guilt was, though never before, *that I can remember* | Di D 374 I looked at nothing, *that I know of*, but I saw everything | ib 121 he took a book sometimes, but never read it *that I saw* | ib 254 I had no particular liking, *that I could discover*, for anything | Carlyle R 1.15 My father has not, *that I can think of*, left his fellow | ib 2.104 Several blackguards among our ancestors, but not one blockhead *that I heard of!* | id H 126 Protestantism has not died yet, *that I hear of!* | Ru F 86 we are not sinners, *that we know of* | Swinb L 101 I never was hand and glove with him, *that I remember.*

This is found very rarely without a negation: Carlyle R 157 twice *that I recollect* I specially saw him.

**8.5₁.** *That* like the OE relative particle *þe* can never have a preposition before it as the *wh-* pronouns can. In early ME the preposition (or adverb, see 8.7₃) was placed before the verb, later after the verb, and this is always the position in MnE. Examples (only a few are necessary):

Vices a V. 51 He ðat alle cnewes (= knees] to cnelið | AR 192 þet þing þet ich am of scheadewe | ib 68 þet ilke uniseli gile þet ich of seide | Ch MP 3.964 torche bright That every man may take of light ynogh, and hit hath never the lesse || Fulg 22 this is the mater that I come fore | Sh H4A II 1.77 there are other Trojans that thou dreamest not of | Hml III 1.63 the thousand naturall shockes That flesh is heyre to | ib III 1.82 rather beare those illes we haue, Then flye to others that we know not of | AV Mark 10.38 can ye drinke of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptisme that I am baptized with (thus also in v. 39, only with *withall*) | AV Ex 32.13 and all this land that I haue spoken of, will I giue vnto your seed (thus often in AV) | Goldsm 656 somebody that I know of | Sheridan 269 you will never read anything that's worth listening to | De Quincey 354 it is not you that I am angry with | Di N 207 Mr. Watkins, you know, Kate, that your poor papa went bail for | Marett Anthropol. 57 he protects [his head] with something that neolithic man was probably without, namely, an old bowler hat | Locke F S 202 bookcases filled with books that no gentleman's library should be without | Galsw Frat 132 (vg) till she came . . . with her mouth that you can tell she's bad by.

**8.5₂.** Sometimes we have two verbs, one without and one with a preposition, as in More U 146 these thynges that men vse and lyue by. Somewhat different in Di N 582 ruddy lips that to look at is to long to kiss.

Cp similar sentences in contact-clauses 7.2₆ and in clauses with *wh*-pronouns 10.2₆.

**8.61.** The relative *that* is frequently used in a way that would be impossible with the *wh*-pronouns: if we substitute *which*, it will be necessary to add a preposition, and the whole combination will be a subjunct in the relative clause. (But the clause as such is an adjunct to the antecedent). This is particularly frequent in indications of time, where it is recognized as correct English:

Ch A 44 fro the tyme that he first began To ryden out, he loved chivalrye | Sh LLL V. 2.143 Vpon the next occasion that we meete | id Wint IV 4.688 this is the time that the vnjust man doth thriue | AV Luke 17.27 vntill the day that Noe entred into the arke | ib 29 But the same day that Lot went out of Sodome, it rained fire | Defoe G 31 at the same time that he claims to be known | Wells H 33 he was able to remark . . . the while that his eyes sought eagerly for the other occupant of the car | Butler Er 264 the driver can stop the engine at any moment that he pleases.

**8.62.** After words indicating manner, etc., *that* is often used in the same way but is "now considered slipshod"(NED):

Marl J 21430 This is the reason that I sent for thee | Sh Merch II 6.8 who riseth from a feast with that keene appetite that he sits downe? Where is the horse that doth vntread againe His tedious measure with the vnbated fire That he did pace them first? | Sh As I 2.9 thou lou'st mee not with the full waight that I loue thee | Spect 41 The pope's sister was in those mean circumstances that Pasquin represented her | ib 2 it was bounded by the same hedges in William the Conqueror's time that it is at present | Swift P 31 by spelling the words in the very same Manner that they are pronounced by the Chief Patterns of Politeness | Austen P 320 he spoke with the same good-humoured ease that he had ever done | Dickinson C 56 The reason that I stand for war is, not that I admire the activity of killing and being killed in the modern way, but that I admire the power to face and endure that | Philips L 54 we parted in the same cordial fashion that we met | Butler Er 123 if he had seen the matter in the same light that I did.

**8.63.** From combinations like "*the moment that* he entered" and "*by the time that* you are dressed, breakfast will be ready", we are led to the rare "*directly that* he discovered her, he turned away", where an adverb and not a substantive is the antecedent. Thus more often *now that*, e. g. Sh John III 4.180 'tis wonderfull, what may be wrought out of their discontent, Now that their soules are topfull of offence (H6 C IV 6.1) | Mary Shelley F 136 At first I had neglected them [papers]; but now that I was able to decipher the characters, I began to study them with diligence | Di D 596 Dora came stealing down to meet me, now that I was alone | Shaw 1.189 Now that I think of it, dearie, dont you go encouraging him.

**8.64.** *Now that* sometimes half loses its temporal signification and approaches that of 'considering, seeing that'; it alternates with *now when* in the purely temporal application in Mary Shelley F 236 I renew this request now when I am only induced by reason and virtue . . . and now that you are returning to England you will have little chance of meeting with him | Carlyle FR 444 now that his Majesty has accepted the Constitution, who would not hope? . . . the Queen herself, now when the Constitution is accepted, hears voice of cheering.

There is also a corresponding use of *once that*, e. g. Ru Sel 2.406 once that they are established . . . very few years are enough.

If *directly*, *now*, *once* are used in the corresponding way without *that*, we have what is generally termed a transition of these words into the class of "conjunctions".

**8.65.** In quite recent times the use of adverbs like *everywhere* and *anywhere* with the relative *that* has become common; it should be compared with the same words without *that* 7.71, and with the use of adjuncts mentioned in 1.19. Examples:

Kipl J 1.223 they are taken up mountains, anywhere that a mule can find a road | Wilde In 201 everywhere that Shakespeare turned in London, he saw . . . | Carpenter

P 104 indeed almost anywhere that the distinctively commercial civilization has not set its mark | McKenna Sh 57 I used to get sent anywhere that there was good copy to be obtained | id K 175 electric lights . . . they're hung so that you get no light anywhere that you want it | Walpole C 196 Everywhere that Ronder went he spoke enthusiastically about the Archdeacon.

*That* is used in the same way after an expanded *anywhere* in Galsworthy F 317 who lives in London, Cannes, and anywhere else that the whim takes him | James A 1.193 I will take you to live anywhere in the wide world that you propose.

**8.6₆.** It is easily seen that this use of the relative *that* is closely related with its use after *it is* followed by a subjunct in sentences like: it was *there* (or, *in Italy*, *in my early youth*, *then*, *in this way*) *that* I first made his acquaintance | Stev T 58 It was *on seeing that boy that* I understood, for the first time, my situation | It is *because he is cruel to animals* that I dislike him. Compare the two sentences: "It was his independence that he fought for" and "It was for his independence that he fought" | "It is the younger firm that I am transacting business with" and "It is with the younger firm that I am transacting business". Is it really correct, as most, or perhaps all grammarians do, to separate these two cases and to speak of a relative pronoun in one and of a conjunction in the other sentence?

The literary predilection for the *wh*-pronouns sometimes leads writers astray, so that they use *which*, where this conjunctional *that* is required: Austen P 288 it is not of peculiar, but of general evils, which I am now complaining. *Which* of course would have been better justified, if the sentence had been: It is not p., but g. evils which I am now complaining of. On the other hand Thackeray uses a redundant *to*: VF 296 It was to Mrs. Brent, the beetle-browed wife of Mr. Commissary Brent, to whom the General transferred his attentions.

In French we have the two types: « C'est à Jean que j'ai parlé » and « C'est Jean à qui j'ai parlé » with the occasional mixture « C'était de la Mouquette dont elle parlait » (Zola, see Malmstedt, Des locutions emphatiques, Nyfilol. sällskapets i Stockholm publikation, 1905, p. 73ff., where other languages are also dealt with).

Compare finally corresponding combinations without *that*: Sheridan 302 is't thus we meet? | Masterman WL 34 It was here he led his simple home life | Shaw Ms 107 it was to Tyler we owed the Fitton theory.

**8.71.** After thus surveying the facts we are in a position to deal with the question, What is this relative word *that*, which we have found used in various ways? Is it a pronoun, or what?

It seems to me best not to call the relative *that*,with which we have been dealing in this chapter, a pronoun at all, but a particle (see on that comprehensive term PG 87 ff.), or if one wants to distinguish several sub-classes under the head of particles, then to call it a conjunction (or connective). This enables us to see clearly the difference between the two words spelt in the same way:

(a) demonstrative pronoun, sg *that* (full vowel), pl *those*,

(b) conjunction (uninflected particle) *that* (weak vowel).

We then also understand the close similarity between two kinds of clauses, both possible with or without the introductory *that*:

(1) I know (that) you mentioned the man.

(2) I know the man (that) you mentioned.
I know the man (that) you spoke of.
I knew it the moment (that) you mentioned it.
Now (that) you mention it, I remember perfectly well.
It is his own confession (that) I lay most stress on.
It is on his own confession (that) I lay most stress.

Compare also the parallelism with *as*, *than* and *but*, see ch. IX.

**8.72.** Those who look upon *that* as a relative pronoun do it chiefly or exclusively because it seems to fill the same functions in the clause as the relative pronouns *who* and *which*: it is subject or object in cases like the following:

There is a man $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{who}\\\text{that}\end{matrix}\right\}$ wants to speak to you.

This is the man $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{whom}\\\text{that}\end{matrix}\right\}$ we met yesterday.

I like the dress $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{which}\\\text{that}\end{matrix}\right\}$ you wore yesterday.

If, on the other hand, we call the relative *that* a particle (conjunction), there seems to be no subject in the first, and no object in the second and third of these clauses. But need that deter us? I think not. The *that*-clauses are, on the contrary, brought closer to contact-clauses, as far as grammatical analysis is concerned, for we have exactly the same absence of subject or object in such clauses as

There is a man below *wants to speak to you.*

This is the man *we met yesterday.*

I like the dress *you wore yesterday.*

We must recognize the fact that there are clauses without any subject—but that is true of other clauses as well, in which it is not possible even by the hypothesis of ellipsis or subaudition to find a subject, e. g. after *than*: Hml 1 5.167 There are more things in Heauen and earth, Horatio, *Then are dream't of* in our (your) philosophy. Cf 11.8.

**8.7₃.** If this view is taken, we must further say that *of* has no object in "Here is the key that you spoke of": *of* is thus, as it were, degraded from a preposition into an adverb (see on the difference PG 88). But the curious thing is that this corresponds exactly with the grammatical instinct of the middle ages, for in the few cases in which a distinction was then made in form between a preposition (without *-e*) and the corresponding adverb (with *-e*), the latter form was used in these cases, e. g.

Oros 268 þæt hus þe hiora godas *inne* wæron | Ch E 1837 blessed be the yok that we been *inne* (rimes: sinne) | AR 192 þeo ilke uondunges þet we beoð nu ibeaten *mide* | ib 194 hit is Judases cos þet he ou *mide* cusseð.

I see the same unconscious grammatical analysis in the frequent Elizabethan use of *withall* at the end of the clause, for *withall* may be considered the adverb belonging to the preposition *with*: Sh Wiv II 1.90 one that I am not acquainted withall | AV Mark 10.39 and with the baptisme that I am baptized withall, shall ye be baptized.

**8.7₄.** As a final argument in favour of the view here taken I must mention that the relative *that* is thus brought

in close connexion with the use of *that* which was so extremely frequent in earlier periods, where it stood to our eyes redundant after other conjunctions, relative adverbs and relative pronouns: in the modern period it has been discarded from both polite and familiar speech:

*if that, unless that, lest that, because that, for that, though that, but that, after that, before that, ere that, since that, till that, while (whilst) that, how that, where that, when that, why that, whether that* (cf 2.2).

The similar use after the relative pronouns:

*who that, which that, what that,*

was frequent in Chaucer and his contemporaries, see e. g. Mandev. 179 every man takethe what part that him lykethe | ib 184 fro what partie of the erthe that men duelle . . . | ib 221 And whoso that wole, may leve me, ȝif he wille; and who so wille not, may chuse | ib 247 the husbonde may ligge with whom of hem that him lykethe.—From the 15th c. Caxton R 63 who that is deed muste abyde deed | ib 36 to saye what that he wolde | ib 58 what that pleseth the kynge, that muste wel be don. Similarly in dependent interrogative clauses, e. g. Fulg 24 Loke what answer that ye now haue.

**8.7₅.** We have thus brought together a great many phenomena, which traditional grammar puts into various separate pigeonholes, though they are in reality identical means of connecting a clause with the rest of the sentence, either without any form-word or with the empty and therefore in many cases superfluous particle *that*. We may even say that in *I know you mentioned the man*, and in *I know the man you mentioned* we have clauses with direct contact, and in *I know that you mentioned the man*, and in *I know the man that you mentioned*, we have the same kind of clauses with mediate contact, *that* being used to cement the two closely connected parts of the sentence.

**8.7₆.** I have held the view here advanced ever since in my undergraduate days I first brought out my "Kortfattet engelsk grammatik for tale- og skriftsproget" (Copenhagen 1885): there I expressly avoided

the name pronoun and used among others the examples "I know the man (that) you mentioned" and "I discovered it the moment (that) I entered" with "directly I entered" in a foot-note. I then called attention to the agreement between these clauses and "genstandssætninger" (content-clauses): both are joined to the main clause either immediately "I know the man you mentioned" | "I know you mentioned him" or by means of *that*, which is distinct from the demonstrative *that* by being unstressed. I also mentioned the parallel in vulgar Danish "den mand *at* du talte om", etc.

Quite recently Kruisinga has brought forward the view that our *that* is not a pronoun, but a conjunction, see *English Studies*, Oct. 1924 and Febr. 1927; in the latter place he advances a new argument in favour of our common view, namely "that in the sentence *I heard it from a lady who herself was present*, the pronoun *who* could not be replaced by *that*, the reason being that *herself* cannot be added to a conjunction". [But how about *this is the man that had written the article himself?* This is quite normal].

---

# Chapter IX.
# Relative as, than, but.

## Relative as.

**9.11.** The conjunction of comparison *as* often serves to introduce clauses which must be termed relative. Many grammarians then call *as* a relative pronoun, and it is true that it may be said to play the same role as *who* or *which*. If it is called a pronoun, we must say that *as* is

the subject in such women *as knew Tom*
the object in such women *as Tom knew*
the object of the preposition in such women *as Tom dreamt of*.

Consistency then requires us to say that *as* is a relative subjunct, or, as many will say, an adverbial accusative, in "he went away the same way *as he had come*", and further that *as* is the subject of the verb in *as regards religion*, and the object in *as he often said*. Further it seems to be a natural consequence of this view that *than* is looked upon as a pronoun in "more women *than ever came here*" (subject), "more

women *than he had seen there*" (object), and "more women *than he dreamt of*" (object of the preposition). And finally *but* has the same claim to the title of pronoun in "I see none *but are shipwrecked*" (subject) and "nothing so great *but a mob will forget* in an hour" (object).

It seems, however, hardly natural to extend the name of pronoun to all these cases. After what was said above (8.75) on *that* it will not surprise my readers if I prefer using the term particle or conjunction in speaking of *as*, *than*, and *but* in these employments, exactly as in other uses of the same words. This puts all the clauses here mentioned on the same footing and also approximates them to contact-clauses. If it is asked what then is the subject of the verb in "such women as *knew* Tom" and "more women than ever *came* here" and "there are no women but *admire* him", the answer must be that there is no subject in these clauses, and that there is the same lack of a subject in "all the women that *admire* him" and in "there's a man below *wants* to speak to you". In the same way there is no object in the other clauses. Nothing is gained in such cases by putting up fictitious subjects and objects: it is much better to face the simple truth that there are clauses without a subject and others without an object, just as there are sentences without either. The word-order shows that *Tom* is the subject of "such women as Tom knew" and the object of "such women as knew Tom", and that is all one needs know.

**9.12.** The use of relative *as* began in the twelfth century, and there is no necessity to assume, as Pabst does (Anglia 13.296), that it was partly due to ON *es*; the native word (OE *eallswa*, ME *alse*, *ase*, *as*) suffices to explain it; the development is parallel to that of Scandinavian *som*, which from being the conjunction of comparison has become the ordinary relative.—The relative use of *as* started after *such* and *same*, where it still has its chief domain. In the latter case also the other relatives may be used, the distinction being, according to the NED (*as*), that "*same as* usually expresses identity of kind, *same that* absolute identity, ex-

cept in contracted sentences, where *same as* is alone found; cf 'he uses the same books as you do', 'he uses the same books that you do', 'he uses the same books as you' ". It should be added that not only *the same that*, but also *the same who* and *the same which* are used (4.92), also contact-clauses (7.21, 7.26, 7.41, 7.61). But the distinction as made in NED is too subtle to be generally observed. The element of comparison is hardly discernible in many applications of *such as*, which comes to stand simply for *those who* (or *which*) and has to some extent even ousted that combination from ordinary use. This further leads to the vulgar use of *as* as a relative after all kinds of antecedents, where there is not the slightest trace of any comparison.

**9.13.** With regard to *the same as* with a full clause, it is curious that although NED says that this is "now the commonest construction" there are no quotations for it in Mätzner, Koch, Western, Poutsma, and only very few in NED itself (under *as* and *same* 1d). Kruisinga § 1171 has two from the *Times*.

Defoe Rox 187 they were ordered to show her the same respect as they would to me | id Pl 171 you are fleeing from the same dreadful enemy as we are | Walp RH 187 he would perhaps after to-night never be the same man as he was before | Butler Ess 192 if he attaches the same meaning to a certain symbol as the sayer does | Abercrombie Interl 49 It's the same thing as lets Poor straw exult into a shouting blaze.

**9.14.** *As* may take the place of a subjunct in the same way as we saw above with regard to *that* (8.6): Swift 3.34 I set down the troop, *in the same manner as* I took them up | Defoe Rox 163 I had told him my opinion of matrimony *in just the same terms as* I had done my merchant | Kipl M 215 he answered *with the same absolute simplicity as* he was questioned | Hope Z 96 We rode *in the same way as* we had come out the evening before.

If there is no verb in the clause after *the same*, neither *that* nor the *wh*-pronouns can be used, but only *as*: he

speaks the same language as you | the price is the same as before the war.

**9.2₁.** Examples of *as* after *such* are plentiful: Ch Parl 283 maydens, suche as gunne hir tyme waste In hir servyse | Mandeville 82 othere, that asken him grace, suche as han served him | More M 33 suche thynges as shalbe profytable . . . suche peoples as do lyue to gethere | ib 95 | ib 221 annye man whome (2. ed. annye suche as) they canne gette | Roister 17 all such as I meete | ib 82 | Sh Cæs I 2.194 Let me haue men about me, that are fat, Sleeke-headed men, and such as sleepe a-nights | Sh Hml III 2.335 such answers as I can make, you shal command | Mi S 1631 from such as nearer stood | Bunyan G 9 judgments; yet such as were mixed with mercy | Spect 173 I came towards her with such an awe as made me speechless | Franklin 94 to propose it to such as they thought lovers of reading | Trollope W 27 he was such a listener as most musicians would be glad to welcome | Wells T 3 he spent such holidays as he could arrange in unsatisfactory interviews || Peacock M 246 the perfection of the beauty of female eyes, such as some men have passed through life without seeing | Shaw D 110 such inconvenience as a prudent man would get married ten times over rather than face.

**9.2₂.** A preposition is placed at the end of the clause beginning with *as*:

North 252 content with such credite and authority, *as* he would please to countenance them *with* | Sh Tp IV 1.156 we are such stuffe *as* dreames are made *on* | Otway 169 such wrongs *As* you upbraid me *with* | Swift 3.32 such [tryal] *as* I have not observed the least resemblance *of* in any other country | Defoe M 208 some linen and other things, such *as* I knew very well the value *of* | Byron DJ 5.96 with such an air *As* Venus rose *with* from the wave | Lamb E 2.19 he was not half such a coward *as* we took him *for* | Russell Ed 39 Opinions should be such as could be discussed pleasantly at dinner, not such *as* men would fight *for*.

**9.2₃.** *As* without preposition is parallel to the cases

mentioned above (9.1₄): Alden U 90 areas which could be worked *at such times as* a sudden depression in trade largely increased the number of the unemployed.

**9.2₄.** The absence of case-inflexion in *as* and the impossibility of having a preposition before it necessitates the use of *wh*-pronouns in More M 183 suche *in whome* . . . they haue perceaued a singular towardnes | Kemp Nine DW 22 writes scoffingly of such *whose* pages shooes he was vnworthy to pipe | Defoe G 85 the ignorant gentlemen were such *whose* blood was tainted | Swift T 114 for such, *whose* imaginations dispose them | such cases *in which* . . .

**9.2₅.** But even apart from these cases, *who* is sometimes found after *such*: Swift 3.264 strangers, especially *such who* are countenanced by the Court.

*As* alternates with *that* and *which*: Sh Hml III 4.41 Such an act *That* blurres the grace and blush of modestie . . . Oh such a deed *As* from the body of contraction pluckes The very soule | Bunyan P 159 such *as* sell their birthright . . . such *as* blaspheme the Gospel with Alexander: and *that* lie and dissemble | Lytton K 304 besides such additional articles of dress *as* he thought he might possibly require, and *which* his knapsack could not contain.—This of course is slipshod English.

In the following sentence *that* is due to the distance from *such* and to the intervening temporal *as*: Defoe P 101 and such loud and lamentable cries were heard as we walked along the streets, *that* would pierce the very heart to think of.

**9.2₆.** Relative *as* is also used in comparisons after *as* or *so*: Sh Merch IV 1.328 be it *so much*, *As* makes it light or heauy in the substance | Swift 3.154 Neither did I know any artist *so nice and exact*, as would undertake to make me another | Goldsm 57 in a manner *so exquisitely pathetic as* moved me | Austen P 204 delivering her opinion on every subject in *so decisive a manner as* proved that she was not used to have her judgment controverted | Wordsworth P 7.340 child *as beautiful*, *As* ever clung around a mother's neck, Or father fondly gazed upon with pride | Shaw Ms 18 Not one of them has *as much* brains in his whole body *as* Bentley has in his little finger | There are *as good fish* in the sea *as* ever came out of it.

In rare cases *as* is used after *enough*, because it means the same thing as *so much*: Rose Macaulay T 133 touched with just enough remorse for past neglect as might serve for a temperate shadow of repentance.

**9.2₇.** *As* often approaches the value of *that* (consecutive conjunction) + *it*: Walton A 51 you have *so excellently* cook'd this fish, *as* makes me ambitious to be your scholar | Spect 166 *in such a way of life as* may enable them to vie with the best | ib 181 they utter themselves *in such a manner as* a clown would blush to hear | Macaulay H 2.95 the correspondence which they kept up with England was *such as* [= that it] tended to excite their feelings.

**9.3₁.** As *that* and *those* very often mean exactly the same thing as *the same*, it is no wonder that *as* should sometimes be used relatively after these pronouns; this is frequent in Shakespeare, see Abbott § 280, Sh-Lex p. 1196; in more recent writers it is comparatively rare: Sh Wiv V. 5.57 But *those as* sleepe, and thinke not on their sins, Pinch them | Sh Cæs I 2.33 I haue not from your eyes *that* gentlenesse And shew of loue, *as* I was wont to haue | Bunyan P 76 we were going *that* way *as* you are going | Defoe M 44 he could never go on with me in *that* station *as* we stood before | Behn 334 making *that* noise on his sword, *as* was agreed between them | Fielding 1.429 your wife is not a woman of *that* spirit *as* mine is | Stevenson B 332 *those* of the foot soldiers *as* had not found place upon a ship.

Thus also sometimes after the definite article: Swift P 26 all *the* oaths *as* are now current.

**9.3₂.** In vg speech, *as* is used as a relative even after a personal pronoun, e. g. Congreve 277 (sailor): Let *them* marry you, *as* don't know you | Di Pw 2.1 Fine time for *them as* is well wropped up, as the Polar Bear said to himself, ven he was practising his skating | Di F 401 *him as* I have made mention on.

Thus in the humourous colloquialism: Di L 66 I do believe, though *I* say it *as* shouldn't, that they are good 'uns | Williamson L 45 'though *I* say it *as* shouldn't. Cf *that* 5.2₁.

Galsw TL 176 Handsome is as handsome does. In this form of the proverb *as* is used instead of *that*, cf 3.7₁.

**9.3₃.** Dialectically we have constructions with *as* similar to those mentioned in 5.6:

GE A 175 I knew a man *as his* father had a particular knowledge o' the French | ib 194 the brown-and-white jug, *as it's* niver been used three times.

**9.3₄.** In the following quotation, *as* is used in the same way as the *that* mentioned above, 8.4₂: GE A 206 have you heard any particular news? No, *not as I remember.*

**9.4₁.** We have seen (8.1₇ff.) exclamatory and parenthetic combinations like *Beast that I am!* When it is not, as here, a substantive, but an adjective that is placed first, *as*, not *that*, is used, and we must treat these constructions here among relative or quasi-relative clauses. The force of these clauses generally is concessive, *bad as this is* meaning 'however bad this is'; cf also the variant *bad though this is* (*be*). In former times it was usual to have here *as . . . as* or *so . . . as*; this is still found in Scott, but is now obsolete. See on these constructions Stoffel, *Intensives* p 77ff. with examples so far back as Rob. of Gloucester (so fre as we beth) and Piers Plowm. (so wis as thow art holde).

Examples of the old construction: Sh H5 III 2.28 As young as I am, I haue obseru'd these three swashers | ib IV 1.119 I beleeue, as cold a night as 'tis, hee could wish himself in Thames vp to the neck | Swift 1.310 As universal a practice as lying is, and as easy a one as it seems, I do not remember to have heard three good lyes in all my conversation | id J 257 but, as empty as the town is, a fool got hold of me | id 3.44 as flourishing a condition as we appear to be in to foreigners, we labour under two evils | id 3.156 and 3.157 | Fielding T 4.103 As poor a wretch as I am, I am honest | id 4.371 as contemptible a creature as I was, I then admired myself || Sh H4A I 1.1 So shaken as we are, so wan with care, Find we a time for frighted peace to pant.

**9.4₂.** An old example of the present construction is AR 158 Seint Iohn, hwat dude he? ȝung of ȝeres ase he was, fleih awei into þer wildernesse.

Modern examples: Swift 3.99 Scared and confounded as I was, I could not forbear going on | Goldsm 669 Tortured as I am with my own disappointments, is this a time for explanations? | Mary Shelley F 155 Pitiless as you have been towards me, I now see compassion in your eyes | ib. 201 This winter has been passed most miserably, tortured as I have been by anxious suspense | GE M 2.14 she had a poor chance for marrying, down in the world as they were | Carlyle FR 487 The Feuillant Club, high as it once carried its head, she has the satisfaction to see shut | Ruskin T 191 an office which—Utopian as you may think the saying—will soon now be extinct | Trollope D 46 Think of her position, left as she is without a mother! | Hardy L 46 I have no right to reproach him, bitter as I feel, and even though he has blighted my life for ever | Shaw 2.24 I know some family secrets, young as I am.

**9.43.** When in such combinations we have a present participle of a transitive verb, it may have its object immediately after it, as in "*Munching the apple as he was*, he yet had an eye for all John's movements"; but it would be impossible to say, "munching as he was the apple". If the object is not given at once, the corresponding form of *do* must be used instead of the verb *be;* in the following quotation the first participle has an object, and the second has become practically a pure adjective: NP 17 Knowing as they do the character of the government . . . they can hardly blame the rest of the world . . . Startling as those proposals are, they certainly imply the evacuation of territory conquered . . .

As *interesting* is chiefly used as an adjective, it would be impossible to say, on the analogy of the first sentence: "interesting as the book does the ordinary reader, it yet fails to please literary critics"; this should be, "Interesting as the book is to . . ."

**9.44.** *As* is constantly used in the way mentioned in 9.41 in combinations with *like:* Sh H4A III 1.258 Sweare me, Kate, *like a lady as thou* art, where *as* refers not to *lady*, but to *like*; further examples: ib III 3.122 like a foule-mouth'd man as hee is | Defoe R 2.173 like a beast as I was | Cowper L 2.161 he waited on the Bishop, like a blundering ignoramus as he is, without his canonicals | Brontë J 231 return to your nests like a pair of doves, as you are | Di Do 292

treasuring up every word he said (like a young spy as he was) | GE A 3 like a plucky small man as he was, he didn't mean to give in | Froude C 2.420 She fought against it, like a brave woman as she was.

The analogy of these common expressions probably made Dickens use *as* in D 596 Heaven bless you both for a pair of babes in the wood as you are.

**9.45.** *As* may be used instead of the more common *that* after a substantive: Sh Mcb III 5.2 Haue I not reason, beldams as you are? | Bunyan G 16 But, poor wretch [= wretched] as I was, I was all this while ignorant of Jesus | Brontë J 337 for, summer as it was, I had become icy cold in my chamber | Caine M 311 he remembered the vision of the night before, and broad morning as it was, he trembled (cf Thack N 351 Early as it was, his neighbour had been up before him) | Di N 477 Waiter as he was, he had human passions | Hope Z 257 villain as the man was, I did not relish being one of a crowd against him.

**9.46.** Sometimes we find the word-order adjective + indefinite article + subst., which is necessary when the adjective is preceded by *as* (or *so*), even if this conjunction is not found. (A survival of the old construction with *as*?). Thus in two examples given in MEG II 15.175: Thack N 139 *Excellent a woman as she is*, I would not like to live in lodgings where there was a lady so addicted to playing | GE Mill 1.13 *Big a puzzle as it was*, it hadn't got the better of Riley.

**9.47.** Very often a subjunct is pre-posed in the same way, followed by *as*; our first quotation shows the connexion between this order and the pre-position of adjective:

Stevenson T 3 bad as his clothes were, and coarsely as he spoke, he had none of the appearance of a man who sailed before the mast | Thack N 630 Seldom as I saw you together, I could see that you were harsh | GEA 280 That was a rare impulse in him, much as the brothers loved each other | ib 423 Often as Dinah had visited Lisbeth she had never slept in the cottage | Di D 125 | Tenn L 2.184 A. showed a noble disregard of money, much as the loss would

affect us | Ru Sel 1.279 and around them, far as the eye could reach, still the soft moving of stainless water | Ru P 1.186 often and often as my mother used to tell the story, I never asked | Shaw M 53 I wish I could believe that, vilely as you put it | Macdonald F. 229 Little as he guessed it, he was to be back in England very soon.

**9.48.** In the same way an object may be pre-posed followed by *as* with the same concessive signification (cf 'however bad an opinion I have'). The first quotation shows the same 18th c. use of double *as* as with predicatives (9.41); the following two quotations show the parallelism between this construction and the pre-position of subjuncts and predicatives:

Fielding T 2.273 as bad an opinion as I have of mankind, I cannot believe them infatuated to such a degree || Brontë J 586 Long as we have been parted, hot tears as I have wept over our separation, I never thought that she was loving another | Di Do 251 Gloomy as it was, and rigid justice as she rendered to its gloom, she forgave it a great deal || Ward R 2.121 the passion for science, little continuous work as he was able to give it, grew on him more and more | Stevenson M 167 Little as he said to me, and that of not much import, I have rarely enjoyed more stirring company | Shaw C 33 Much as you did for me, I may say . . . | Hawth 1.279 the house which—many such sunrises as it had witnessed—looked cheerfully at the present one.

**9.51.** There are other cases in which *as* can be termed a relative connective. While in *as far as* (or *so far as*) *we can judge* we have a pure clause of comparison, the difficulty of analysis begins already in Cowper L 1.228 thus establishing, as far as in him lies, the belief of a purgatory | Troll W 27 they were determined, as far as in them lay, to give pleasure —those who call *as* in *such as* a relative pronoun, must consistently do the same here and take *as* as the subject of *lies* and *lay*; this is still more natural in cases like the following, in which *as* has the same function as *what* and *which* in mental parentheses (see 5.7): Cowper L 2.264 But alas! as the

philosophers often affirm, there is no nook under heaven in which trouble cannot enter | Mc Carthy 2.150 and the reaction, as is always the case, was inclined to go too far | Huxley L 2.277 As usually happens, the move was considerably delayed | Mered H 57 as will sometimes happen | Galsw F 141 an excellent fellow, as could be seen from his face | Gissing G 215 as was to be expected, she thought severely of these sorrows | Troll W 28 Mr. Bunce, as may be imagined, was opposed to innovation | Bennett W 2.296 Sophia was not unconscious, as could be judged from her eyes | Locke W 116 Arrange things as seems best to you.

Cp also Swift 3.102 making me a sign to step into it, as I could easily do | Austen M 152 why had not she gone to her own room, as she had felt to be the safest [where *as* might be called a pronoun in the accusative by certain grammarians].

**9.52.** We must further mention the frequent combination "As regards the origin of the dispute, nothing has been ascertained", etc. (This is sometimes written as if it were an independent main sentence, as in Benson D 2.34 And now as regards the immediate future. I think I shall go away to-morrow.)

**9.53.** In a popular way of expressing the highest degree possible we have a corresponding use of *as*:

More M 263 they saue it as muche as maye be | North 250 he was as carefull as possible might be, to defend them | B Jo 3.232 we parted as good friends as could be | Rehearsal 67 as fast as can be | Congreve 270 I can read it as plain as can be | Di D 371 I smiled on Mrs. Crupp, as benignly as was in my power | Thack N 286 Rosey is as good a little creature as can be | Di D 502 we went in, as happy and loving as could be | Morris N 28 the day was growing as hot as need be | Swinb L 135 I am growing as philosophic as need be | ib 155 | Gissing G 333 a girl, poorly dressed, but as neat as could be | id R 207 I put aside this reflection as soon as may be | Kipl K 15 As soon as may be | Locke W 277 It was as near perfection as could be.

There is a popular variant with repetition of the adjective after *as*: Di F 485 you are as wise as wise can be | ib 617 his own state and purpose were as bad as bad could be.

With suppression of the verb we get popular emphatic expressions like Stevenson T 265 I hear that old song comin' out *as clear as clear* | Bennett ECh 76 I was *as calm as calm*. Cp the repetition without *as*: an old, old man. Children will even say "as bad as bad as could be".

**9.54.** *As* is the relative substitute for a predicative adjective in much the same way as *so* is the demonstrative substitute (in "Is he happy? He seems so | she is happy, and so is John"); see, e. g. Di N 35 he seemed very much astonished at the outward appearance of Mr. Squeers, as indeed he was | Hope Z 188 he is a brave man, as are all of his house.

## Than.

**9.61.** As already remarked (9.11), *as* in all these cases cannot be grammatically separated from the use of *than* in combinations like "he offers more than could be expected" and "more than we could expect". But could *than* by any means be called a relative pronoun? The parallelism is evident in Defoe G 16 This is granting as much as can be demanded, and, perhaps, more than is demanded. Cf also Di D 409 her services have been more valuable than was supposed | By 589 we can hear worse than thou hast to tell. With preposition at the end: Sh Tro III 3.204 an operation more diuine Then breath or pen can giue expressure to | id As II 4.57 Thou speak'st wiser then thou art ware of | Defoe M 103 [they] are seen with other eyes than we saw them with, or than they appeared with before.

The collocation of a contact-clause and a *than*-clause is significant in The Times 14.2 '06 to tell Mr. Stead all, and perhaps more than, he cares to know.

**9.62.** Vulgar speech has a redundant combination with *what*: Shaw A 187 youre nearer my age than what he is. Higgins (Gently) Than he is: not "than what he is". Thus also Mackenzie C 215 I'm more in earnest than what you are | 351 I hope you can walk quicker than what you eat. Similarly with *as* ib. 242 they're just as quick with their tongues as what you are | 308 I'm not near so deep as what you are.

## But.

**9.71.** *But* is a negative relative connective, meaning 'that (who or which) . . . not', but only used after a negative expression.

Examples: Sh Err IV 3.1 Ther's not a man I meete but doth salute me | Merch III 2.81 There is no vice so simple, but assumes Some marke of vertue on his outward parts | Lr II 4.71 there's not a nose among twenty, but can smell him that's stinking | Milton A 56 seeing no man who hath tasted learning, but will confesse the many waies of profiting | Walton A 15 there are none that deserve commendation but may be justified | Ruskin Sel 1.370 there is no existing highest-order art but is decorative | Stevenson B 110 there was not one but had been guilty of some act of oppression | Dickinson S 117 I see around me none but are shipwrecked too.

**9.72.** A preposition is placed at the end of the clause: Goldsm 672 there's not a pond within five miles of the place but they can tell the taste of | Ruskin Sel. 1.261 there is not a touch of Vandyck's pencil but he seems to have revelled on.

**9.73.** This relative *but* is extremely frequent after an inarticulate sentence (without a verb), as in Sh.Alls II 3.68 Not one of those, but had a noble father | Lamb R 39 Not a tree, not a bush, scarce a wildflower in their path, but revived in Rosamund some recollection | Quincey 418 and probably not one of the whole brigade but excelled myself in personal advantages | Carlyle H 132 no one of us, I suppose, but would find it a very rough thing | Ruskin S 46 nothing so great but it [a mob] will forget in an hour | Stevenson JHF 8 no gentleman but wishes to avoid a scene.

**9.74.** The negative idea that conditions this use of *but* may be expressed indirectly, or it may be an incomplete negative. Examples: Sh Ven 565 What waxe so frozen but dissolues with tempring? | Lucr 414 What could he see but mightily he noted? What did he note, but strongly he desired? | Milton SA 834 what murderer . . . but may

plead it | Pope RL 1.95 What tender maid but must a victim fall To one man's treat, but for another's ball? || Thack N 674 Scarce a man but felt Barnes was laughing at him | Spencer Ed 22 Scarcely a locality but has its history of fortunes thrown away over some impossible project || Lamb E 2.219 Few young ladies but in this sense keep a dog | Wells T 111 and few of the men who were there but judged me a happy man | Bennett C 1.102 Few of these men but at some time of their lives had worn the clog.

**9.7₅.** In some cases *but* is followed by a personal pronoun in such a way that both together make up a relative pronoun (*but they* = 'who . . . not', etc. cp 5.6). Examples: Fulg 30 There is neuer a knaue in the house saue I But *his* gowne is made in the same wyse | Malory 732 there were but few knyghtes in all the courte, but *they* demed the quene was in the wronge | Sh Mcb III 4.131 There's not a one of them but in *his* house I keepe a seruant feed | Stevenson MP 161 You can propound nothing but he has a theory about *it* ready-made | id B 115 Not a man but *he* is some deal heartened up | Ruskin Sel 1.172 not one great man of them, but *he* will puzzle you, if you look close, to know what he means | Wilde S 81 Women are a decorative sex. They never have anything to say but they say it charmingly [with intentional ambiguity].

**9.7₆.** From the beginning of the 18th c. we find also the combination *but what*. As applied to persons (= who . . . not) this is now vulgar, but does not seem always to have been felt as such: Swift J 489 there is not one of the Ministry but what will employ me | Defoe R 2.4 I had no agreeable diversion but what had some thing or other of this in it | Goldsm V 1.22 scarce a farmer's daughter within ten miles round but what had found him successful | Austen E 29 not that I think Mr. M. would ever marry any body but what had had some education | ead P 306 there is not one of his tenants but what will give him a good name | Quincey 220 political economy . . . is eminently an organic science (no part, but what acts on the whole, as the whole again reacts on and

through each part) | GE A 98 There's nobody round that hearth but what's glad to see you | Benson D 2.129 there is nothing else about me but what is intolerable | Bennett A 20 there is no village lane within a league but what offers a travesty of rural charms. — With a plural verb Defoe M 143 she had no nurses in her business but what were very good, honest people.

For other (non-relative) uses of the conjunction *but* (*but that*, *but what*) see Neg. 130ff.

---

## Chapter X.

## Relative Clauses Concluded.

### Word-Order in Relative Clauses.

**10.1₁.** The natural place of a relative pronoun, like that of an interrogative pronoun and of a conjunction, is at the beginning of the clause. But while this rule is universal with conjunctions, and therefore with the relative *that*, *as*, and *but*, there are a good many exceptions with the *wh*-pronouns, because other tendencies of word-order may come into conflict with the front-position of these pronouns. This is especially true of literary English, which in accordance with the classical languages favours complicated relative constructions foreign to natural colloquial speech.

There is no conflict if the relative is the subject, as this would at all events come first: "the man who wrote the letter"; cp also "the man whose brother wrote the letter".

When the relative is the object of a verb, the pronoun is placed in the beginning of the clause in spite of the tendency to place the object after the verb: "the man whom we met | the letter which he wrote"; cp also "the man whose letter he had read", etc.

**10.1₂.** The same order is also invariably found when the relative is the object of an infinitive or ing placed at the

end of the clause: "a letter which I should like to read" | "books which I am fond of reading"; thus also in the following, more or less unnatural examples:

Shelley L 817 a punishment *which* its victim must be either among the meanest or the loftiest not to *regard* as bitterer than death | Medwin S 234 Well do I remember the scene, *which* I stood with Shelley at the window to *admire* | Hawth 1.420 He had that inward prophecy—*which* a young man had better never have been born than not to *have*, and a mature man had better die at once than utterly to *relinquish* | Sher 283 he is a gentleman *whom* I have long panted for the honour of *knowing* | Stephen L 348 I should be doing the same thing *which* I complain of him for *doing* | James S 76 You mean it was a present? That's just *what* he so dislikes the idea of her *having received.*

**10.1₃.** The pronoun also is placed first if it is at the same time the object of two infinitives: Di Do 279 to propose the health of Mr. Towlinson, *whom to know* is *to esteem* | Tenn 100 Such a one do I remember, *Whom to look at* was *to love.*

The same order is found in Shelley PW 2.381 until the divinity of Jesus became a dogma, *which to dispute* was death, *which to doubt* was infamy | Trollope W 221 he knew every one *whom to know* was an honour.

But in this case it would be possible to prepose the infinitive: "*to know whom* was an honour", though this order is somewhat pedantic: colloquial English always prefers the third possibility: *whom* it was an honour *to know.*

An extreme example of preposed infinitive is Bosw J 1.248 the opportunity which I fortunately had of consulting a sage, *to hear whose wisdom*, I conceived in the ardour of youthful imagination,that men filled with a noble enthusiasm for intellectual improvement would gladly *have resorted* from distant lands. One can imagine the pride with which Boswell penned this passage in his description of his first meeting with Samuel Johnson.

Cf 10.5₃ and 5₄.

**10.1₄.** Participial constructions like those in the following quotations are not natural: Swift 3.296 I happened to wear my gloves; *which* the master Grey *observing*, seemed perplexed | Holmes A 239 they have fixed on two or more double seats, *which having secured*, they proceed to eat apples | Ru T 49 the book *which* the British public, *professing to consider sacred*, have lately adorned for themselves. Cf with a verbal noun Sh Lr V 3.215 the most pitious tale . . . *which in recounting* this grief grew puissant [= in recounting which].

With the participle preposed (continuative): Thack N 25 "I can take it from you, sir"; *saying which* his face flushed, and his eyes filled.

**10.1₅.** *Whose* is sometimes preceded by *all* or *both*: *all whose* on the analogy of *all his*: Macaulay B 190 men *all whose blood* is gall | Murray, Anglia II 376 I know many a man who himself burrs, *all whose children* pronounce the r like other Englishmen.

(Instead of *all who*, *both who* with the first word as adjunct, *all of whom*, *both of whom* is said, cf 10.3₃).

**10.2₁.** The chief conflicts arise with prepositions. In contact-clauses, and in clauses with *that*, *as*, and *but*, the preposition (adverb) always comes last (8.5₁, 9.2₂, 9.7₂), and this position is frequent in *wh*-clauses as well. But here the general tendency to place a preposition before its object has been very strongly aided by the analogy of Latin and other languages. It must be remembered that the *wh*-pronouns owe their extensive use to translations more than to anything else. The reluctance of scholars to use anything that was not found in Latin syntax has led to what Fowler (KE 62) aptly calls "the modern superstition against a preposition at the end", which is particularly powerful in the case of relative clauses.

Among the three possible forms "We were not allowed to walk in the streets

(a) the procession was to march through

(b) which the procession was to march through

(c) through which the procession was to march"—(a) is the ordinary colloquial form, (b) both colloquial and literary, and (c) chiefly literary.

**10.2₂.** We shall now first consider those cases in which the preposition is naturally placed at the end of the clause, because it is felt to be less intimately connected with the relative than with some verb or other word in the clause; very often the two form together a set, composite phrase. Therefore end-position is frequent or even necessary in combinations like:

a thing which he *is fond of*
*longs for*
*is possessed of*
*delights in*
*takes care of*
*has always wondered at*
*has recourse to*
*makes use of*
*has often come across*
*takes advantage of*, etc.

**10.2₃.** *Without* at the end very often forms part of the phrase *to do without* or similar expressions, as in

Keats 5.84 for admiration—which I can *do without* | Ru S 125 There is one more help *which* she cannot *do without* (... *without which she cannot do* would be impossible, because *do* cannot be thus used by itself) | Hazlitt A 4 thy love in return, *which* I cannot live *without* | Carlyle FR 412 the two Waiting-maids . . .; *whom* also her Majesty could not travel *without* | Stevenson M 11 she had been to school . . .; *which*, poor girl, she would have been happier *without* | London M 384 he wondered if he would remove the stiff-rim [hat], *which* never yet had he seen him *without* | NP 06 these women enjoy an amount of financial security *which* the working woman is *without* | Defoe G 21 in a figure *which* he cannot be a gentleman *without*.

In the last sentence most people would nowadays place

*without* first, and this is certainly preferable in "some things without which one cannot make pancakes".

**10.24.** Very often the speaker, when beginning the clause, may not have made up his mind which of two or three synonymous expressions to use: *longs for* or *desires* (*wants*), *is possessed of* or *possesses* (*owns*), etc. If then he chooses a prepositional phrase, the result naturally is that the particle comes last:

More U 253 They be borne onelye to warre, whyche they dylygentlye and earnestlye *seke for* (= seek, try to obtain) | AV Job 3.25 that which I *was afraid of*, is come vnto me (= feared) | Swift 3.185 a gold ring which one day she *made me a present of* in a most obliging manner (= gave me) | Sher 328 those empty pleasures which 'tis so much the fashion to *be fond of* (= like) | Bosw 1.429 upon a subject which it is the fashion of the times to *laugh at* (= scorn, ridicule) | Galsw Frat 157 colours which Hilary was *fond of* (= liked) | Ru S 137 a magnitude of blessing which her husband would not *part with* for all that earth itself (= surrender, give up) | Stev A 136 a reflection exceedingly just in itself but which, as the sequel shows, I failed to *profit by* (= turn to account).

**10.25.** The preposition often forms part of a phrase containing a substantive: examples of the preposition at the end of the clause:

Sh As I 2.116 I would have told you of good wrastling, which you haue *lost the sight of* | Spect 388 the maid whom he *makes love to* | ib 390 a most agreeable young woman, whom I am passionately *in love with* (note the continuation, where the preposition is naturally placed first: and from whom I have for some space of time received as great marks of favour) | Swift 3.71 these false informations, which I afterwards came to *the knowledge of* | Fielding T 4.113 Many stories of the lady, which he swore to *the truth of* | id. 5.570 his Sophia, whom he now resolved never more to *abandon the pursuit of* | 3.593 he expressed so much devotion to serve me, which at least I was not certain of *the falsehood of* | Cow-

per L 1.50 a ministry which they had reason to account themselves happy in *the possession of* | ib 52 a trifle which, if he did not meet with, neither would he feel *the want of* | ib 313 a delicacy on my part, which so much delicacy on his obliged me to *the observance of* | Hardy R 14 that whole which the person formed *portion of* | Hawth S 148 There was a look of pain in her face, which I would gladly have been spared *the sight of* | Ward F 27 he had what so many men of his own class made shipwreck *for want of*—he had imagination | Maugham PV 40 She turned to him with a smile which she well knew *the effect of*.

Some of these constructions are not quite natural, because they do not contain set phrases like *make love to*. Most careful writers would now avoid such a sentence as Defoe M 87 now a new scene of misfortunes attended me, which perhaps few women have gone through *the like of*.

Ruskin is particularly fond of this order, and uses it sometimes in rather a harsh way: C 15 [trust the Bible] not as a fetish or talisman, which they are to be saved *by daily repetitions of* | P 1.1 passing in silence things which I have no pleasure in reviewing, and which the reader would find no help *in the account of* | 3. 75, the cabin, which the waves from the paddle wheels rushed *past the windows of*, etc.

**10.2₆.** Sometimes the end-position of the preposition is necessary, because the relative is at the same time the object of two expressions, one a prepositional phrase, and the other a simple verb (cf 7.2₆ and 8.5₂): Swift 3.60 a great sum of money, which he had *received by order, and ran away with* | Sheridan (Fam. Speeches 215) a hasty prejudice, which he afterwards had the means to *see the error of and to dismiss from his mind* | Carlyle R 2.312 Southey, whom he judged me to *be curious about, and to like*.

**10.2₇.** The absence of an antecedent in relative clause primaries makes it desirable to place the preposition at the end: it would be hard to understand a sentence like "I do of what many dream", hence Browning naturally writes 1.524 I do what many dream of, all their lives. Cf further Sher 371 I am not what I have passed myself for—and especially those cases in which the clause itself is the object

of a preposition: Di D 387 he never raised his eyes from what he was about (other examples 3.2).

**10.31.** We shall now consider some of the prepositions separately.

*Of*: we have already seen many cases of end-position when *of* forms part of a phrase; combinations like "the things which we were talking of" or "these crimes, which he was never guilty of" or "Townly, whom you boast of as your conquest" (Sher 356) are of course frequent; still there are certain cases in which it is unnatural to have *of* at the end, thus if it is the equivalent of a genitive: instead of "this excellent man whom he was the youngest son of" everybody would say "whose youngest son he was".

**10.32.** Partitive *of* is generally placed first: it is not usual to say, or at any rate to write, "these names, which he remembered some of", though one may say "this food, which he partook of". Note the two clauses in Defoe R 56 I also found some rum in the great cabbin, *of which* I took a large dram, and *which* I had indeed *need enough of* to spirit me.

**10.33.** If we say: "He had two daughters, *of whom one* married a judge", we naturally expect some continuation about the other daughter; but this is not the case if we use a different word-order: "He had two daughters, *one of whom* married a judge". This word-order, with the relative preceded by something else beside the preposition, is not infrequent in such partitive expressions: Sheridan 271 I have brought you two pieces, *one of which* you must exert yourself to make the managers accept | Wilde P 108 full of opinions *not one of which* they even understand | Ward M 261 the special requirements, *not one of which* did Darrell possess.

Thus also the frequent combinations *some of whom* (*which*), *all of whom*, *both of whom* (*which*) ; cf 10.15.

**10.34.** End-position of *with* is frequent in combinations like Sh Alls V 3.178 a desp'rate creature, whom sometime I haue laughed with | Mcb III 4.96 those eyes Which thou dost glare with.

Somewhat harsher combinations: Swift 3.105 her

monstrous breast, which I cannot tell what to compare with | Wilde D 154 a man whom no pure-minded girl should be allowed to know, and whom no chaste woman should sit in the same room with | James RH 376 She had three lines of writing in her daughter's hand, which the Cavaliere was despatched with to the Prince.

**10.35.** But there are combinations in which end-position is avoided. Sweet says (NEG § 2126) "even in colloquial speech the construction with preposition + *which* cannot always be avoided, as in *observe the dignity with which he rises!*, where we could not say *the dignity he rises with*, which would, indeed, be unintelligible."—Sweet does not give the reason, which evidently is that *with* belongs closely to *dignity* and together with this nexus-substantive equals an adverb (see PG 137); *with* therefore is different from the same preposition in *laugh with* or in "a knife (which) I can cut the apple with", etc. Similarly: Sher 362 the artful manner in which you first showed yourself to me. The rule that a preposition at the end is admissible "only when used in the literal or the most obvious sense" (Fowler KE 105) applies to most, though not to all cases; it is noteworthy that all the examples he gives begin with *it was*, and that the substantives in the rejected sentences are (with one doubtful exception) all of them nexus-substantives: "it was *a cab* (but not *high indignation*) that he drove away *in* | it was *a concert* (but not *curiosity*) that I was returning *from* | it was *a beech-tree* (but not *unpleasant circumstances*) that I found him *under*". As this chapter shows, his rule requires some supplementing.

**10.41.** There are some prepositions which are always placed before a relative pronoun: *beyond*, *besides*, *as to*. This is particularly true of those prepositions which are still felt as formed from other parts of speech, such as *opposite*, *outside*, *round*, *except*, *during*, *considering*, *concerning*. Freeman: he turned to the door, *outside which* the two servants were hovering [it would be impossible to say "any door that the servants were hovering outside", etc.] | GE S 108 It

had been a clinging life; and though the object *round which* its fibres had clung was a dead thing, it satisfied the need for clinging. *Up* and *down* are generally placed first: Mason R 283 a wall *up which* the leader must be hoisted on the shoulders of his companions | Lawrence LG 99 there was a short cross-way, *up which* one saw the iron foundry. Still it is not uncommon in short clauses to hear: the hill *which* he ran *down* | the tree *which* he climbed *up*.

*Near* will generally be placed first, note however Sher 319 a lonely old house, *which* nobody *comes near* [*come near* = approach].

Similarly we find *like* occasionally placed at the end: Di T 1.118 he was one of the greatest scoundrels upon earth since accursed Judas—*which* he certainly did look rather *like*.

**10.42.** Front-position is the invariable rule with *than* (which always governs the accusative *whom* and must therefore be considered a preposition, at any rate in this combination):

Sh LL III 180 A domineering pedant ore the boy, *Then whom* no mortall so (some mod. ed.s *more*) magnificent | Mi PL II 299 Beëlzebub . . ., *then whom*, Satan except, none higher sat (ib I 490, V 805, X 529) | Defoe R 2.135 my general artificer, *than whom* they could not name any thing that was more useful | Di Do 156 Mr. Toots—*than whom* there were few better fellows in the world | Thack P 1.233 the apothecary, *than whom* a better fellow never put a pipe in his mouth | ib 235 Bullby . . . *than whom* a more jovial spirit 'ne'er tossed off a bumper or emptied a bowl'.

This is rare without a negation expressed or implied: Thack N 27 a distinguished officer like the chevalier, than whom he was a year older [= who was a year younger than he].

In the same way *than which*: Di D 164 a purpose *than which* I have never entertained a more determined purpose in my life | Trollope O 236 you know the state of my mind *than which* nothing is more fixed on this earth | Locke GP 212 as old as woman's guile than which nothing human can

be older. Colloquial English avoids *than whom*, *than which* and uses *who*, *which* with the superlative.

**10.43.** *As* is not frequent with a relative; it is generally placed first, and in our first quotation it governs the oblique form *whom* in the same way as *than*: Drinkwater Lincoln 18 we are proud to bear it to a man *as whom* we feel there is none so fitted to receive it | Thack V 368 rat-hunting in a barn, *as which sport* Rawdon had never seen anything so noble. Occasionally, however, *as* is placed last: Sweet HES (page ?) a sound between ī and u, *which* y might be considered *as* | R. Bennett Web 127 a hooded cobra . . . That's *what* he described it *as*.

Poutsma quotes from Dickens: the little woman I had been so happy as.

**10.44.** The preposition must obviously be placed first in cases like Di T 1.243 a visitor . . . *between whom and you* there is an impassable space | Beaconsfield L 26 he recalled the name of the solicitor, *between whom and himself* there had been occasional correspondence.

**10.45.** A preposition must generally be placed before *whose*: Sh VA 1088 he put his bonnett on, *Under whose brim* the gaudie sunne would peepe | Sher 271 The public is their critic, *without whose fair approbation* they know no play can rest on the stage, and *with whose applause* they welcome such attacks as yours | ib 276 there is no person *for whose judgment* I have a more implicit deference | Galsw M 255 the woman *round whose waist* she had seen his arm (10.41).

It is, however, quite natural to say: a person whose assistance we couldn't *do without* (10.23) | some of the writers whose books I *delight in* | there is no person whose opinion I have a greater *respect for*.

**10.46.** Front-position is necessary in such continuative relative clauses as Bunyan P 85 Faithful looked behind him, *to whom* Christian cried again | Di N 39 Noggs shook his head and sighed; *upon which* Nicholas rose | *in which case*, see 6.52.

**10.47.** Here I print some random examples of prepositions before relative pronouns; I star those in which end-position would be possible or preferable:

Fulg 11 the hye kynge *Of whom* procedith and growith euery gode thing | ib 12 I haue a doughter *in whom* I delight | Sh Sonn 48.5 But thou, *to whom* my jewels trifles are | AV Mark 10.40 giuen to them *for whom* it is prepared | Spect 470 to walk the streets *through which* they patrole | Sher 357 a mystery *in which* you must play a part* | Scott Iv 183 a very small chapel, *of which* the roof had partly fallen in | Macaulay H 1.102 Such were the views of those men *of whom* the excellent Falkland may be regarded as the leader | Ru S 114 that bitter Valley of Humiliation, *into which* only the wisest and bravest of men can descend | ib. 115 the proportion which that little world *in which* she lives and loves, bears to the world *in which* God lives and loves | ib 124 a tutor, *for whom* you have absolute reverence* | ib 122 that [music] *in which* the notes most closely and faithfully express the meaning . . . the simplest, that *in which* the meaning and melody are attained with the fewest notes | Shaw 2.71 like a repeating clock *of which* the spring has been touched || Johnson R 49 wonders *of which* he purposed to solace himself *with the contemplation* (unnatural).

**10.51.** Sometimes we find one and the same preposition in the beginning and at the end of the clause. (The same phenomenon is also found with interrogative sentences):

Caxton R 73 none *to whom* he hath gyuen his saufgarde *to* | Malory 696 the boughe *on whiche* the appel henge *on* | Sh Ro II Prol. 3 That faire *for which* loue gron'd *for* and would die | Sh Tam I 2.148 For she is sweeter then perfume it selfe, *To whom* they go *to* | Defoe R 43 the happy things . . . *of which* he had so sensibly describ'd the middle station of life to be full *of* | Sharp, Browning 120 a pamphlet *of which* he came into possession *of* in London || Stev A 141 a young Irishman, *with whom* I was once intimate, and had spent long nights walking and talking *with*.

Repetition with variation is found in Caxton R 65 an euyl connyng, *of whiche* lyf scathe and hurte may come *ther of* | ib 87 of him *to whom* he had most his trust *on*.

**10.52.** Inversely there is only one preposition instead of two in Swift 3.204 to bear their part *in whatever instrument* they most excelled | Defoe R 2.142 *in the voyage* he was now engag'd. (Cf the correct use of two *in*'s: Ru P 3.7 shutting themselves into a penitentiary on a plain, or *in whatever kind country* they chanced to be born *in*). Cf 3.2.

**10.53.** Sometimes a sentence is built in such a way that the only explanation is that the writer must have first had the construction with the preposition at the end in his mind and then adopted the literary word-order, although the continuation demands the former order, thus

Galsw D 23 the women *to whom he looked up, and thought* so beautiful (instead of: *whom . . . to, and thought . . .*) | Medwin S 38 a regatta *at which he assisted*, in 1809, and seemed to *enjoy* with great zest | ib 163 [the poem] is derived from Plato, *with whose Symposium* he had been long familiar, but only appears to have commenced *translating* at Leghorn | Galsw MP 85 all this London, *of which* he owned so much, and *loved* with such a dumb love | Benson D 34 a beauty *for which* you may search for years elsewhere, and not *find* | Dreiser F 34 one [school] *to which* the Barlows and the Westervelts sent their children and therefore *thought* excellent.

Thus probably also in Sh Tp V 1.193 this famous Duke of Millaine, *Of whom* so often I haue heard renowne, But neuer *saw* before | Browning 1.582 Things done, that took the eye and had the price; *O'er which*, from level stand, The low world laid its hand, *Found* straightway to its mind, *could value* in a trice [which the world laid its hand on, found . . .].

The confusion is obvious in Defoe M 108 I had nobody *to whom* I could in confidence commit the secrecy of my circumstances *to*, and could depend *upon* for their secrecy.

**10.54.** In literary English we find complicated combi-

nations with words preceding a preposition before a relative pronoun. It will be seen that sometimes the sentence would become heavy whichever place you give to the word-group:

Lamb R 27 there was a cordial sweetness in Allan's smile, *the like to which* I never saw in any other face | Scott O 97 solacing himself with a draught of ale, *a huge flacon of which* stood upon the table | Trollope NP '87 she was a companion, *each minute of intercourse with whom* was a delight | Spencer A 1.378 I had read its first pages [of Kant's *Critique*]: *rejecting the doctrine in which*, I went no further | Hope Z 163 certain steps against his treacherous brother, *as to the precise nature of which* they could not be further enlightened | Galsw C 13 the Balkan Provinces, *from a tour in which* he had just returned | Locke GP 56 his bright dark eyes proclaimed him a personality *compared with whom* all the other men around the table were conventional dummies.

Cf also Ru F 197 on the primary duty of loving God,—foundation *other than which* can no man lay | Di D 91 one who is not fortunate in life, and *the many reasons for not insulting whom* you are old enough to understand.

See also *one of whom* 10.3₃.

**10.5₅.** Similar combinations with an infinitive: Thack V 396 delicious entertainments, *to be admitted to one of which* was a privilege | Galsw Frat 199 he would find himself in that building *to keep out of which* he was in the habit of addressing to God his only prayer to speak of.

**10.5₆.** This order is frequent with *whose*: Scott A 1.162 the sea, *the roar of whose billows* announced it still disquieted by the storm | Di D 256 I might take leave of Mr. Wickfield (*my old room in whose house* I had not yet relinquished) | Stev T 189 the Hispaniola herself, *a few yards in whose wake* I was still being whirled along, seemed to stagger | Locke St 93 the little cabinet assigned to her, *from outside whose door* could be unceasingly heard the sharp tearing of materials.

This is different from a word-order affected by Shelley, with some part of the clause placed before the relative: 76 And the swift boat

the little waves which bore, Were cut by its keen keel [i. e. the waves which bore the boat] | 476 And happier they their happiness who knew [i. e. who knew their h.] | 82 As one out of dim dreams that doth awake | 84 All slept but those in watchful arms who stood.

## Whereof, etc.

**10.61.** Compound relative adverbs beginning with *where* take the place of the combination of a preposition and a relative pronoun; they are used extensively without any trace of local signification, but never with a personal antecedent, thus always meaning *of* (*by*, etc.) *which*. I shall give a good many quotations, because there has been some reaction against them, so that they are now not so frequent as in the 18th century. In 1830 the Edinburgh Review blamed *hereby*, *wherein*, *hereupon*, etc. as being vulgar (Oliphant, New Engl. 2.310); nowadays they are looked upon rather as stiff or pedantic.

Fulg 49 a finall answare in this case *Whereto* ye shall trust | Marl F 102 in that famous art, *Wherein* all natures treasury is containd | ib 118 fill the publike schooles with silk, *Wherewith* the students shalbe brauely clad | Sh R3 III 1.196 all the moueables *Whereof* the king, my Brother, was possest | Sh H5 IV 1.191 the time was blessedly lost, *wherein* such preparation was gayned | Sh Lr I 4.241 your good wisedome, *Whereof* I know you are fraught | BJo 3.168 the Thames being so near, *wherein* you may drown so handsomely | Swift 3.12 the strings *wherewith* I was tyed | id 3.19 arrows . . .; *whereof* one very narrowly missed my left eye | id 3.267 their language, *whereof* I understood not a syllable | id 3.391 those [terms] *whereby* they describe the detestable qualities | Scott Iv 370 with a much worse grace than that *wherewith* he had penned the letter | Wordsworth 134 And halfpennies, *wherewith* the neighbours bought A basket | Tenn 332 those long loops *wherethro'* the serpent river coil'd (frequent in Tenn., also *whereat*, *whereout*, *wherewithal*, etc., see Dyboski 155) | McCarthy 2.110 the ministry of Lord Derby, *whereof* Mr. Disraeli was undoubtedly the

sense-carrier | Archer A 130 the Russian Empire, *whereof* the idea is a blind and slavish superstition | Raleigh S 5 the lungs *wherewith* they breathe | ib 100 a decorative use of figure, *whereby* a theme is enriched with imaginations | Ward M 314 the pretty hat of grey tulle, *whereof* the strings were tied under the chin | NP '17 A regulation has been issued *whereunder* all leaflets bearing on peace negotiations have to bear author's and printer's name.

**10.62.** These relative adverbs may be preceded by other words in the same way as the *wh*-pronouns:

Swift 3.59 trees . . . *the tops whereof* I could but just reach with my fist clinched | id 3.96 a continent, *on the south-side whereof* was a small neck of land | Bridges E 147 She question'd in her mind what place the goddess meant, *arrived whereat* she might descend to Hell.

**10.63.** Occasionally we may here (as in 10.51) find a preposition repeated at the end of the clause: Malory 721 the shyp *wherein* Percyual had putte his syster *in*. In a different way Bacon A 2.20 a small boate, with about eight persons in it; *whereof* one *of them* had in his hand a tipstaffe (the adv. here refers to persons).

**10.64.** The *where*-adverbs may introduce a continuative relative clause; this is especially frequent with *whereupon*. Examples: Bunyan G 9 my pleasures did quickly cut off the remembrance . . . *Wherefore* with more greediness . . . I did still let loose the reins | Swift 3.101 *Whereupon* I made a sign.

## Relative Concatenation.

**10.71.** A relative clause may be concatenated or interwoven with another clause. The simplest case is with a content-clause after some verb like *say*, *hear*, *fear*, etc.

Here again there is no difficulty if the relative is the object in the concatenated clause: Bosw 1.13 a defect that many of his friends knew he had | Shelley L 583 Inclosed is ten pounds—which be so good as to say that you have

received safe | Brontë V 245 There I found what I own I anticipated I should find | Ru S 6 to put what I fear you may think an impertinent question | Troll D 3.9 a man whom she soon found that it would be impossible she should ever marry.

**10.7₂.** Nor is there any formal difficulty in cases like the following:

Ch MP 1.94 Thou art the bush . . . the which that Moises wende Had been a-fyr | Sh Err IV 4.10 Here's that [= what] I warrant you will pay them all | Wint IV 3.90 ouer that art (which you say addes to Nature) is an art That Nature makes | Swift 3.151 whenever I committed any folly that she thought would be diverting to her Majesty | Sher 276 there must be something that you think might be mended | McCarthy 2.384 to take part in what they were led to believe would be the great national uprising of the Irish people | Hardy L 47 a little house which he had found was to be let | Shaw M 30 Why do you say things that you know must pain me?

**10.7₃.** In all these quotations nothing is shown with regard to the case of the relative, but with *who* a difficulty arises: which is correct: "We feed children *who we think are hungry*" or "*whom we think are hungry*". All grammarians, English and foreign, agree that *who* is correct, and *whom* a gross error. The latest condemnation is that of Mr. Fowler in MEU 724: "there is real danger of its becoming one of those sturdy indefensibles, of which the fewer we have the better, and of good writers' taking to it under the hypnotism of repetition. We have not come to that pass yet; good writers keep clear of it; but it is high time for emphatic protests". When Mr. Fowler says that "probably no grammarian would have a word to say for it" (for *whom*), he has overlooked the two pages I wrote on the subject in PG 349ff., and I may be allowed to repeat parts of what I said then, with a few additions.

It is admitted that *whom* is common, but it is thought that this form is used chiefly by recent journalists and writers

of slipshod English. Now my first argument is that the idiom is found in many authors of repute: I reprint some of my quotations in full and indicate the place where others of them may be found:

Ch (Ros 3021), B 665 yet wol we us avyse Whom that we wol that (some MSS. omit *that*) shal ben our justise | Caxton R 86 his fowle hound whom I neuer see doth good | Sh John IV 2.165 Arthur, whom they say is kill'd to night | Alls II 1.202, Cymb I 4.137, Meas II 1.72, Cor IV 2.2, Tp III 3.92, Tim IV 3.120 | [AV 1 Sam 25.11 Shall I . . . giue it vnto men, whom I know not whence they be?] | Walton A 30 S. James and S. John, whom we know were fishers | Goldsm V 2.41 Thornhill, whom the host assured me was hated | ib 47 Mr. Thornhill, whom now I find was even worse than he represented him | Franklin A 148 (twice *whom*, but once *who*) | Shelley L 453 to anyone, whom he knew had direct communication with me | Keats 5.72 I have met with women whom I really think would like to be married to a poem | Kingsley Y 35 | Darwin L 1.60 | Mulock H 2.11 | Kipl DW 36 the Woman whom we know is hewn twelvearmed | Wells Sleeper 118 the Sleeper—whom no one but the superstitious, common people had ever dreamt would wake again | id Ma 1.246 | Churchill C 237 | Benson A 150 I met a man whom I thought was a lunatic | Ingpen, Shelley in Engl. 624 | Oppenheim People's M 149 | id Laxw 111 and 276 | Burt Brand. Ir. 89—besides various newspapers and the official Report on Honours 1922.

To these I can now add, among others Boswell J 1.112 the attention of one whom he had been persuaded to believe would be a respectable patron | Galsw Ca 167 the girl's admiration for one whom she could see would in no circumstances lose her dignity | Mackenzie C 7 There was a man, too, whom she had only just time to realize was the doctor, not the undertaker | Dreiser F 89 . . . said one whom Davies later learned was Seavey, the village postmaster | Sutton Vane, Outw. Bound 63 two of our fellow passengers. The two whom I see are not here.

To which must be added some cases of predicative from various translations of the Bible, from Hugh Walpole, Farnol and Oppenheim (see PG 350).

**10.74.** The frequency of *whom* in such sentences is all the more noteworthy because the tendency in English has gone for centuries in the opposite direction, towards using *who* instead of *whom* as an object. There must therefore be a very strong feeling that the relative in "children whom we think are hungry" does not stand in the same position as in "children who are hungry", where no one would think of substituting the form *whom*. The relative must accordingly be felt as somehow dependent on *we think*, from which it is not separated by any pause whatever: a pause would be unnatural, and, as a matter of fact, it is quite impossible to use the form *whom*, if we add *as*, or indeed if we make a pause without using *as* before the inserted clause: "children, who, as we think, are hungry," where we have a real insertion without any influence on the sentence which is broken up by the intercalated passage. In "children, whom we think are hungry," on the other hand, we have a peculiar compound relative clause, in which I should not say that *whom* in itself is the object of *think*, but rather, that the object of *think* is the whole nexus, whose primary is *whom* (which is put in the accusative, because the nexus is dependent) and whose predicate is the finite combination *are hungry*. The form *whom* is used because in "who we think" the speech-instinct would be bewildered by the contiguity of two nominatives, as it were two subjects in the same clause.

There is a second test by which we can show that the speech instinct does not take the relative as a real subject, namely the possibility of omitting the relative pronoun, which, as a general rule, can only be omitted in English when it is not to be the subject. Zangwill writes (G 326): "Is it so with everything they say is wrong?"—he would not have omitted the relative except for the insertion of *they say*, for "Is it so with everything is wrong?" is not English. Some other examples are given above, 7.43.

**10.75.** A further argument (not mentioned in PG) may be drawn from such sentences as the following, in which clauses of this type are treated as completely parallel with others in which we have an object-relation: Sh Meas II 2.31 There is a vice that most I doe abhorre, And most desire should meet the blow of iustice | Tarkington W 141 Human nature is so everlastingly full of oddities it's always turning up new ones that you sit and stare at and can't believe are real. The same is true of Sh Wint I 2.330 in spite of the form *who* (frequent in Sh in the object): the blood o' th' prince, my sonne, (Who I doe think is mine, and loue as mine).—Observe that here it would be impossible to combine the two clauses if there was no insertion: new ones that you stare at and are not real | my son who is mine and love as mine.

**10.76.** In PG I have drawn further argument from similar constructions in Danish and French. The orthodox reasoning in favour of "children who we think are hungry" is this: the relative is the subject of *are hungry*. A subject should stand in the nominative. *We think* is an insertion that cannot change anything in the relation between the relative and *are*. *Who*, not *whom*, is the nominative. Ergo: "children whom we think are hungry" is wrong.—But two of these premises cannot hold water before our closer inspection: a subject need not always be in the nominative, and the insertion of the words *we think* can and does change the relation between the relative pronoun and its verb.

**10.77.** When we find the form *who* used in such constructions, the reason may be one of two: either the insertion is felt to be clearly parenthetic, preceded by a pause: this is often indicated by the punctuation, see e. g. Sh Cæs III 2.129 I should do Brutus wrong, and Cassius wrong: Who (you all know) are honourable men | Lamb E 1.25 There was one H-, who, I learned, in after days, was seen expiating some maturer offence in the hulks | Brontë V 173 As to Mrs. Bretton—who, I afterwards found, had been out in the open air all day | ib 294 | St. John Ervine NP '25 Mr. Bancroft, who, I think, has the makings of a good actor in him.

Or else we have an effect of the usual tendency to use *who* everywhere as an accusative, aided (in recent times) by the teaching of grammarians that *who* is correct in these clauses because it should be the subject. It may be worth while printing some examples:

Fielding 5.577 to avoid the pursuit of Mr. Western, who they knew, would send after them in a few hours | Goldsm V 1.188 Mr. Burchell, who I recollected had of late several private conferences with her | ib 2.194 and 222 | Bosw 1.162 Garrick, who I can attest from my own knowledge, had his mind seasoned with pious reverence [pause?] | Di D 74 There was another boy, one Tommy Traddles, who I dreaded would make game of it . . . There was a third, George Demple, who I fancied would sing it (but immediately before with indication of a pause: There was one boy . . . who, I conceived, would read it in a rather strong voice) | Bennett P 258 except of course your esteemed mother, who we all agree is perfect | Galsw Ca 234 the bullfinch perched on his pillow, who they knew perhaps might soon be in their power.

**10.78.** Sometimes the concatenation proper is avoided by means of the preposition *of*, as in Seeley E 274 One body of persons *of which* we can positively affirm that without *its* support the Government could not stand.

**10.79.** *As* is found in the same kind of concatenated clause: Mi A 35 in such a place of philosophic freedom as they supposed England was | Austen S 256 to give such particulars of Edward as she feared would ruin him for ever | Hope Z 49 Fritz shrugged his shoulders, as I began to see was his habit on most occasions | Wordsw Lit 10 such [feelings] as all men may sympathize with, and such as there is reason to believe they would be better and more moral beings if they did sympathize with.

**10.81.** The relative clause is concatenated with a temporal or conditional clause; the following examples show various types, chiefly modelled after Latin syntax:

Sh Ro I 5.74 It is my will, *the which if thou respect*, Shew a faire presence | Swift 3.338 *which when his Yahoo had*

*found*, he presently recovered his spirits | Fielding T 4.293 when you gave me that advice, *which* I had been happy *had I followed* . . . I was ruined by a very deep scheme of villany, *which if you knew* . . . it would mitigate my offence | Goldsm V 2.134 he delivered the letter *which*, *when Mr. Thornhill had read*, he said . . . | Thack P 1.257 literature . . . *into the leaves of which when Helen dipped*, she read such things as caused her to open her eyes with wonder | Beaconsf L 85 individuals *whom*, *if you do not meet*, you become restless | Ru Sel 1.175 the details and the whole, *which* an artist cannot be great *unless he reconciles* | Ru S 39 to understand a little more of the thoughts of others, *which so soon as you try to do* honestly, you will discover . . . | Gissing G 277 the theory that there is one particular woman *if he misses whom* he can never be happy | Shaw D 309 plays *which* the Committee itself had to turn the public out of the room and close the doors *before it could discuss.*

An example with *as*: Ru S 84 they are such *as* the national temper must be much bettered *before it would bear.*

**10.82.** The relative is sometimes the object at the same time of the verbs of both clauses: Cowper L 2.205 a man *whom if you know you must love*, and if you do not, I wish you did | Archer A 172 Emerson, dwelling in a serener ether than ours, *which*, *though we may never attain*, it is yet a refreshment *to look up to.*

**10.83.** In the following cases the relative is seemingly the object of one and the subject of another verb; Mi PL XI 676 But who was that Just Man, *whom had not Heav'n Reseu'd*, *had* in his Righteousness *bin lost*? | Fielding 1.453 he hath in his possession a letter from each of your aunts, *which unless we get back*, *must ruin* them both.

**10.84.** Two relative clauses are concatenated: Mi C 51 [Circe] *whose charmed cup whoever tasted*, lost his upright shape | Pope Man 4.328 See the sole bliss Heav'n could on all bestow! *Which who but feels can taste*, *but thinks can know* | Fielding 3.513 that being *in whom whoever rightly confides*, must be superior to all worldly sorrows | ib 523 a blessing

*which he who possesses* can never be thoroughly unhappy | Shelley 563 sounds *which whoso hears* must needs forget All pleasure and all pain | Carlyle R 1.17 a truth *which whoso liked* was welcome to come and examine | id FR 380 poor ancient dames,—*whom* the heart were hard *that did not pity* | Ru F 6 truths . . . *which the fools who deny* can only live, themselves, because other men know and obey | Hawth 1.326 cakes, *which whosoever tasted* would longingly desire to taste again | Browning 1.531 that way Over the mountain, *which who stands upon* Is apt to doubt if it be meant for a road | Lang E 117 Thackeray had the kindness and helpfulness *which* I, for one, have never met a jounalist *who lacked.*

Note *its* in Bosw J 1.201 an opinion *which they who have never experienced its truth* are not to be envied: it would not be much better to begin *whose truth they who* . . .

In a different way we have two relative pronouns in one clause: Di T 2.100 the same Monseigneur, the preparation of *whose chocolate for whose lips* had once occupied three strong men.

**10.85.** A relative clause is concatenated with a clause of purpose: Shelley L 593 I have many literary schemes, *which* I thirst to be settled *that I may begin.*

---

## Chapter XI.

## Nexus. Subject.

**11.11.** In this chapter we shall begin the treatment of nexus, and must first try to make clear what is meant by this term.

Two words (or word-groups), one of which is primary, and the other secondary, may be combined in two essentially distinct ways, according as they form a junction or a nexus. (See PG ch. VIII). The meaning of a junction is

one single idea, a unit, which for some reason or other is linguistically expressed by the combination of two elements; as the junction is thus one composite name for one thing, it is often possible to express the same idea by one (primary) word, e. g. red wine: *claret* | silly person: *fool* | reading man (man who reads): *reader* | a man who steals: *thief* | one to whom a lease is granted: *lessee*, etc. A nexus, on the other hand, contains two ideas, which must necessarily remain separate. The secondary word (or word-group) adds something new to what has already been named, and stands in that particular relation to the primary which we term predicate-relation; thus the finite verb *reads* and the infinitive *read* in "the man reads" and "I heard the man read" stand in the predicate-relation to *the man*, and the combinations of *the man* with these two forms illustrate two varieties of nexus.

This chapter deals with the most important class of nexus, that in which the predicate-part is a finite verb, as in *the man reads* | *the man reads the Bible*, etc. But it is necessary to keep in mind that there are other kinds of nexus (e. g. with the infinitive: *I heard the man read;* with a participle: *the man having read this*, we left the house; with a verbal noun: *on the doctor's arrival* | *on the doctor arriving*, etc.). These various kinds will be treated in their due place, see provisionally PG ch. IX; but what will be said in this chapter on the relation between subject or object and predicate applies also to nexus of the other kinds not exemplified here.

**11.1₂.** Sometimes we have what should be logically a nexus expressed in the form of an adjunctal group. If we compare the following statements:

(1 a) Too many cooks are dreadfully untidy,
(1 b) Too many cooks spoil the broth.
(2 a) Many hands are seldom washed,
(2 b) Many hands make quick (light) work.
(3 a) No news could be more welcome,
(3 b) No news, they say, is good news (Di D 488),

it is easy to see the difference in signification between the three instances of normal adjunctal combination of an adjective and substantive (denoted *a*) and the three cases of predicational combination (denoted *b*). In *a* it is possible to substitute a paraphrase with *there are* (*there is*): "there are too many cooks who are dreadfully untidy", while in (b) we must paraphrase something like: "the fact that we have too many cooks (that the cooks are too many), or the presence of too many cooks, spoils the broth", etc. Combinations with *many* are generally found in proverbs only, where we have corresponding expressions in many languages.

Other examples of *b* are: *Many dogs* soon eat up a horse (given in Muret as translation of: Viele hunde sind des hasen tod) | Trollope B 281 it was hard for him to know what answer to give. And yet *no answer* would be his surest condemnation | Di X 4 *no eye at all* is better than an evil eye | Shaw D 299 the defence was more damaging to it than *no defence at all* could have been | Locke FS 193 There are times when *no word at all* is the kindest | Maxwell F 223 the mother that was worse than *no mother* | Galsw WM 112 *no dividend* would be a sign, no small one, of bad management | id P 2.51 You must put up with *no hot dinner* | Collins W 28 You will have to begin this morning by putting up with *no other company* at breakfast than mine. | All work and *no play* makes Jack a dull boy.

I subjoin here some quotations which show more or less similar constructions, where, however, we do not have an adjunct instead of nexus: Goldsm 648 question for question is all fair | Bennett A 120 and all the eyes of the marketplace was [N. B.] preferable to the chance of these eyes | Defoe R 2.97 two men to fifty was too much odds | once is no custom | once a week is enough for me | slow and steady wins the race.

**11.13.** The simplest nexus is one in which there is only one primary, as in *the dog barks* | *this man is reading*. Here the primary (*the dog*, *this man*) is the subject of the verb, which is the predicate (*barks*, *is reading*).

In other sentences there are two or even three primaries connected with one and the same predicate, as in *this man*

*is reading the paper* | *the Captain gave his daughter a watch.* In these examples *this man* and *the Captain* are the subjects, and *the paper*, *his daughter*, and *a watch* are objects. (If the last sentence had run: *This morning the Captain gave his daughter a watch*, we should have had a further element, *this morning*, which is a subjunct; but subjuncts will not be treated in this volume).

In "the water boils (in the kettle)" *the water*, and in "the kettle boils" *the kettle* is the subject; the double expression is made possible, neither by different relations between subject and verb nor by different meanings of the verb *boils*, but by the fact that *kettle* here means 'what is in the kettle', exactly as *glass* means 'what is in the glass' in "I drank another glass". But in "she boils the water" the verb *boils* is used in a different sense (causative): therefore besides the subject *she* we have an object *the water*.

**11.14.** The primary which is the subject or object of a verb may be either

a substantive: *the man* rises | bury *the man*,—or
an adjective: *the dead* arise | bury *the dead* (II ch. XI),—or
a pronoun: *he* rises | bury *him* (II ch. XVI, XVII)—or
an adverb: leave *here* (above ch. I),—or
a clause: *that he has come* is surprising | we hear *that he has come* (above ch. II and III),—or
a nexus: he made *his wife happy* | we heard *him come*,—or
an infinitive: *to hear him* is a great pleasure | I want *to hear him* (1.3).

**11.15.** The subject cannot be defined by means of such words as active or agent; this is excluded by the meaning of a great many verbs, e. g. *suffer* (he suffered torture), *collapse*, as well as by passive constructions, for in "he is beaten" *he* is the subject, but not the agent. Cp. also: "he broke the twig" and "he broke his leg", "he had his hair cut" (here *he* is the agent, because the meaning is 'he caused his hair to be cut') and "King Charles the First had his head cut off" (Di D 189, where the same explanation does not hold good).

How are we to distinguish between the subject and the object (or the objects)? The subject is the primary which

is most intimately connected with the verb (predicate) in the form which it actually has in the sentence with which we are concerned; thus *Tom* is the subject in (1) "Tom beats John", but not in (2) "John is beaten by Tom", though both sentences indicate the same action on the part of Tom; in the latter sentence *John* is the subject, because he is the person most intimately connected with the verb *beat* in the actual form employed: *is beaten.* We can thus find out the subject by asking *Who* (or *What*) followed by the verb in the form used in the sentence: (1) Who beats (John)? Tom | (2) Who is beaten (by Tom)? John.

**11.1₆.** There are also outward signs which sometimes, but not always, assist us in recognizing the subject, viz.

(1) form; but only a few pronouns have separate subject-forms (nominatives): *I* saw him | *he* saw me | *they* told her | *she* told them, etc.

(2) position, generally before the verb, either immediately before it or separated from it by a subjunct: *Tom* beats John | *Tom* never beats John; or else after the verb in certain generally well defined cases, which will be treated in detail in another place. Here a few selected examples may suffice: Had *the witness* no money? | Out rushed *the man* | Crack goes *the whip* | Neither did *the judge* hear the answer | Stevenson JHF 171 So the physician said in his prospectus, and so said *all the citizens* in the city. When the object is exceptionally preposed, the subject yet comes immediately before the verb in ordinary prose: Di D 244 Talent, *Mr. Micawber* has; capital, *Mr. Micawber* has not. The following order, with the object between the verb and the subject, is quite exceptional and only justified, because *took place* is a set phrase: Macaulay H 1.172 Early in 1661 took place *a general election.*

Some combinations are ambiguous, because there is nothing to show whether a word is a subject or an object, thus some shortened clauses after *than* and *as:* Fielding T 4.186 I know my cousin better than you. Here clearness may be obtained by means of the verb *do:* better than you do |

better than I do you | Lang Tennyson 48 Tennyson liked Society no better than did General Gordon.

**11.17.** Any primary in a nexus which is not the subject is an object. The relation between verb and object is different from that between subject and verb, yet it is in so far similar as in both cases we have a nexus between a primary and a secondary member, and we may accept Schuchardt's dictum that the object is a subject placed in the shade (jedes objekt ist ein in den schatten gerücktes subjekt).

**11.2.** The notional uncertainty of the distinction between subject and object makes us understand certain shiftings in which what was formerly the object has become the subject of the same verb. I have treated this change of construction in *Progress* § 173ff. = *Ch. on Engl.* § 71ff., and W. van der Gaff subsequently wrote a whole book on "The Transition from the Impersonal to the Personal Construction in Middle English" (Heidelberg 1904). Here I shall give some fresh illustrations of the old and new constructions with some of the verbs while referring to my former treatment, in which I tried to give a psychological analysis of the motives for the shifting. But I should not now speak of these verbs as "impersonal".

The change of construction was brought about by (1) the greater interest taken in persons than in things, which caused the name of the person to be placed before the verb, (2) the identity in form of the nominative and the oblique case in substantives (adjectives) and some pronouns, and (3) the impossibility of distinguishing the cases in certain constructions, e. g. Ch MP 5.108 that made me to mete.

In the following paragraphs I place first examples of the old construction, then (in some cases) of combinations which may be interpreted either way, and finally of the new construction.

Cf 16.9 on *want*, etc.

**11.21.** *Like*, OE *lician*, originally meant 'please' and took its object in the dative. We may give a typical sentence in its various stages in the following way:

(1) þam cynge licodon peran.
(2) the king likeden peares.
(3) the king liked pears.
(4) he liked pears.

Here (1) corresponds exactly to G. *dem könig(e) gefielen birnen; peran* is subject, and the verb accordingly is in the plural. In (2) the distinctive signs of the dative have disappeared, but the verb still preserves the pl-ending; through the disappearance of weak *-en* we get (3), where no formal traits show whether *the king* or *pears* is the subject. The natural feeling, however, made the former the subject, and this is shown by the possibility of saying in the present *the king likes* (no longer *like*) *pears*, and by the use of the nominative *he*, thus also *I like pears*. Now the G translation of *like* must be by means of another verb instead of *gefallen:* er hat birnen gern (or, mag gern).

In the case of the following verbs a translation does not always show the shifting as clearly as here; still the semantic transition is always present; in most cases the verb began by meaning 'give an impression' and came to mean 'receive an impression'.

Examples: Sirith 257 a foreward That the mai ful wel like | Ch HF 860 Parde, hit oghte thee to lyke | Fulg 25 yf it myghte lyke you | Dekker F 1969 Which of these apples likes thee best? | Marl E 1632 So pleaseth the Queene my mother, me it likes | Sh As Epil 20 | Oth II. 3.49 it dislikes me || Ch B 2254 al that hir housbonde lyked for to seye || Caxt R 60 how lyke ye my children | Fulg 23 if he like you (in the modern sense) | Redford W 68 I lyke not that waye. — In my previous work I called attention to "the latent though complete change which has taken place in the grammatical construction of more than one phrase while seemingly handed down unchanged from generation to generation. I am thinking of such phrases as:—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| if | *you* | *like* |
| if | *you* | *please* |
| formerly: | dat. (pl) | 3rd pers. sg. subjunctive |
| now: | nom. (sg. or pl.) | 2nd pers. (sg. or pl.) indic." |

With *list* and (partly) with *please* we have the same shifting as with *like*.

**11.2₂.** *Ail:* AR 356 euerich wo þet eileð flesche (dat.) | Ch F 501 nothing eyled me | Caxt R 21 what eyleth yow | Wordsw 168, Stevenson JH 62, etc. What ails you? | Swift J 182 to see what the D— ailed him on Sunday || Beaumont 221 What ails my sister? || Gammer 96 what the deuill they ayle | Marl J 1193 what ayl'st thou? | Sh Alls II.4.7 what do's she ayle | Scott OM 170 What ailest thou..what ails thee now | Southey L 95 whenever he ails anything. Cp. also the participle *ailing:* Thack VF 76 She has become interesting by being ailing of late.

**11.2₃.** *Rue, repent:* Ch B 4287 it reweth me | Caxt R 53 it repenteth hym and is sory (note this continuation) | Swinb P & B 1.46 But will it not one day in heaven repent you? (archaic) || Ch A 3530 thou shalt nat rewe | id R 4058 Thou shalt repente... Thou shalt forthenke, and sore rewe | Caxt R 28 ye ought sore repente you | Marl E 1852 I rue my lords ill fortune.

**11.2₄.** *Dream* and synonyms: Ch Ros 51 thus dremed me | ib 25 Me mette swiche a swevening || Mal 65 Thenne the kyng dremed a merueillous dreme || Ch B 4117 this dreem, which ye han met to-nyght | I dreamt that I was a king.

**11.2₅.** A similar shifting is found with *become.* We say *this dress becomes your sister* ('looks well on her'), but there is an obsolete use in which the subject is shifted: Sh John II.1.141 O well did he become that lyons robe | Wiv III.3.64 | Edw 3 II.1.395 The lyon doth become his bloody iawes | Congreve 105 I think the women have more musical voices, and become nonsense better | Richardson G 57 he would better become his dress if the pains were less apparent | Lytton K 287 She will become the family diamonds.

**11.2₆.** There is a corresponding obsolete use of the verb *matter:* Congreve 229 I don't much matter your solos [= they do not matter to me, I do not care for] | Defoe R 2.36 he matter'd not whether he went | id G 11 | Gay BP12

| Fielding T 1.85 if it had not been out of doors, I had not mattered it so much.

**11.27.** Compare also the dialectal use of *belong*, see EDD Cumberland: Who belongs yon dog? | Leicestershire: Hi, mister! D'yo belong this 'ere ombreller? (In other parts of the country with *to:* Somerset: Who do belong to these here bullicks?).

**11.31.** From *him were better (to) go* (it would be better for him to go) is developed Sh As III.3.92 *I were better* to bee married, and, on the other hand, *I had better* go. Similarly with *rather:* Marl J 147 Rather had I a Jew be hated thus, Then pittied. *I'd rather* was often taken to be short for *I would rather.* (ChE p. 88ff.).

*Woe* is originally a sb; the old construction is seen in Ch MP 3.566 *me* [dat.] is wo [subject] | Ch E 139 wo were *us* [dat.] alyve. But as the case is not shown in substantives, as in Ch MP 2.3 was never *wight* so wo, etc., the original dative was supplanted by a nominative, and thus already Ch MP 3.1192 *I* was so wo | Heywood P 177 I wolde be wo. Now it is obsolete, except in Sc: Barrie T 376 I'm mortal wae for her.

**11.32.** Phonetic development assisted in causing confusion between OE *me þyncþ* and *I þence*, *methinks* and *I think*, see ChE 81ff. Hence *I think long* (obsolete) = 'it thinks (seems) long to me, I long (for)': Caxt R 99 my wyf shal thynke long after me | Heywood P 204 yet to be here I thought longe | [Defoe M 20 I was at home before anybody thought me long] | See Stoffel, *Studies in Engl.* 120ff.

**11.33.** With *seem* the shifting has not taken place in Standard English, but in Somerset *I zim* now means 'it seems to me', exactly as in Dan. *jeg synes.* There are, however, certain constructions in which *seem* has a personal subject instead of *it*, especially before *as if*, *as though* (with a similar insertion into the main sentence as with *long* 11.45) Thack P 1.176 he seemed as if he was going to say something | Browning 1.272 I read and seem as if I heard thee speak | Mackenzie C 86 She seemed as though she ought to be spoilt.

This is different from *I seem* = 'I seem to me', as in Brontë V 376 still I seemed to trace a likeness | ib 399 I seemed to hear Père Silas. — A shifting in the opposite direction is observable in Ch F 56 Hem semed han geten hem proteccions (= they seemed) | id R 214 Hir semed to have lived in langour; cf ib 305, 313.

**11.34.** *Happe*, later expanded into *happen:* Ch G 649 Ful oft him happeth to misusen it | with it: Ch C 885 it happed him, par cas, to take the botel || (NED *hap* from ab. 1400, *happen* from Cursor Mundi) | Mal 726 I maye happen to escape | Sh R 2 IV.1.330 to effect what euer I shall happen to deuise (the only example in Sh) | Fielding 4.389 She happened to be out of town. Very frequent in PE.

Sometimes without an inf.: GE A 441 I couldna think how he happened away from church. — In the rare construction Sterne 75 the horse... could never go lame, or happen any mischance — *the horse* would originally be a dative, and *mischance* the subject; but in the 18th c. *the horse* would probably be taken as subject and *mischance* as object.

**11.35.** *Chance:* Joye 1535 Yt chaunced me to turne | Spenser: At last him chaunst to meete upon the way A faithlesse Sarazin (both NED) || More U 25 I chaunced to espie thys forsayde Peter | Sh Shr. IV.1.209 if she chance to nod, Ile raile and brawle | Meas III.2.27, if he chance to faile he hath sentenc'd himselfe | Trollope (NED): If he chanced to be at home.

When followed by an infin. without *to*, *chance* is indistinguishable from an adverb, as in Sh H 4 B II.1.12 It may chance cost some of vs our lives. — It is possible that the dialectal adverb *happen* (= 'perhaps') may have arisen through some such process. See e. g. GE M 2.304 Happen you'd like Mumps for company, Miss.

**11.41.** The construction of sentences like "he is sure to come" = 'it is sure that he comes (will come)' is evidently similar to that seen in "he happens to come" (see on the notional analysis 11.9); but they do not seem to have developed in the same way: people seem never to have said "him is sure to come". According to NED *sure* 12, "this sense was orig. subjective, but came subsequently to express, and now always expresses, objective certainty"; *he is sure to return* meant formerly what is now expressed by *he is sure of returning*. Examples of the present use:

Marl E 2336 Yet he that is the cause of Edwards death Is sure to pay for it | Sh Ant 11.3.26 If thou dost play with him at any game, Thou art *sure* to loose | Sh H 5 IV.1.127 so should he be sure to be ransomed | Cowper L 1. 186 Some subject will be sure to present itself | McCarthy 2. 258 A season of political energy is sure to come after a season of political apathy | Wilde D 18 he would have been sure to meet Lord G there | When they come together, there is sure to be trouble.

**11.42.** Similarly with *certain:*

Walton [1653, NED] I'l be as certain to make him a good dish, as I was to catch him | Defoe Rox 127 if she lives she is certain to see them all hate her | Macaulay E 3.34 It was certain to produce a strong impression | we shall be certain to meet him. — Hence the appositional use in Di D 184 any dog of a fellow, certain to ill-use her | Swinb L 23 a fellow . . . certain to get on comfortably with most people.

**11.43.** And with *safe:* Di H 113 a prudent young man, who was safe to rise in the world | Childers R 219 we're safe to get aground | Maugham PV 119 As long as he's got her to depend on he's pretty safe never to do a foolish thing.

**11.44.** Cp. also Defoe Rox 155 what was *improbable* to happen at that time | Carpenter Art of Cr. 86 two mistakes are *inevitable* to occur.

**11.45.** *Like* (obsolete), *likely:* Sh Tp IV.1.237 now Jerkin, you are like to lose your haire | Wiv IV. 5.119 | Merch I.3.131, etc. | Swift J 98 I have been sometimes like to do it || Ch T 3.1221 (NED) there I likly was to steruyn | Sh H6 A V.5.74 For Henry, sonne vnto a conqueror, Is likely to beget more conquerors | Sh Hml V.2.408 For he was likely, had he beene put on, To haue prou'd most royally | mod.: she is not likely to be up so early.

Here we may mention certain idiomatic expressions in which a personal subject is used where one might expect the pronoun *it*: Sh Wint III.3.8 Ile not be long before I call upon thee [i. e. it will not. . .] | Johnson R 46 we are long before we are able to think | Defoe R 2.229 they were some

time before they could resolve | Mulock H 1.95 Even John's loud knocking was some time before it was answered | Lawrence LG 95 after this, she was a long time before she forgave Alvina | Wells TB 1.28 a brisk discussion of how long we were to the longest day. Compare the construction in "he was not long (in) coming".

**11.51.** Sometimes the subject is not indicated correctly, in so far as a person is substituted for some material thing (instrument, etc.) belonging to him, as when one says "I am afraid I'm fast" [= my watch is (too) fast] or when a cyclist says that he is punctured [= the tire of his wheel]. Thus in Sh Tp II.1.308 why are you drawn? [= swords; also Mids. III.2.402, H 5 II.1.39] | Defoe R 109 the first three, being loaded again, gave them a third volley [= guns] | Mered R 13 I'd shot you, if I'd been loaded | Ritchie M 216 when at length we were packed and ready; cf Mered E 434 | Bennett HL 256 we 're full up [= boarding-house]. Cf also Defoe R 2.207 on board us [= our ship] | Childers R 236 Was she never on board you?

Cp in French Mérimée Deux Hér. 27 Voulez-vous vous allumer? | ib 29 Oserai-je vous demander du feu. Je suis éteinte.

**11.52.** There are also some verbs which in some idiomatic combinations take as their subject what in another, and seemingly more proper application is joined to the verb with a preposition: the garden *swarms* with bees = bees swarm in that place: Mi PL 1.762 the spacious hall... Thick swarm'd.. but in 775 So thick the aerie crowd Swarm'd | Cowper L 1.22 the place swarms with them. This stream *abounds* in fish = fish abound in this stream (note the participle or participial adjectives: a stream *abounding* in fish | fish are *abundant* in this stream). Cp. further:

Ch Parl 188 colde welle-stremes... That *swommen* ful of smale fishes lighte | Mason F 292 hovels *crawling* with vermin | Wells Br 213 Germany.. It's all crawling with soldiers | Masef Lost E. 107 the place is crawling with Indians | Gone Native 166 both men were tired out and *running* down with sweat | Brontë J 358 with my veins running fire | in Cassell's

Dict. "snivel" is explained: to run at the nose | Maxwell EG 355 Her face was *streaming* with tears now | Di F 711 with the lower part of his sleeves, where he had dipped into the river, streaming water | ib 587 his hand was *trickling* down with blood | Stevenson B 113 the woods *lie thick* with our ill-willers. [Bennett RS 131 Half of the large table *was piled* several feet high with books].

Similar shiftings are frequent in other languages, G.(Paul Prz ⁴156), Dan., (bordet flyder med papirer), Swed., &c.

**11.5₃.** Some phrases are similarly double-faced: the officer who was *in charge* of the prisoners (thus Macaulay E 4.295, Caine E 59) | the prisoners who were in the charge of that officer || Bennett C 2.26 he was not *in control* of his intelligence | his intelligence was not in his control || he was *in possession* of a large fortune | the fortune that was in his possession || I take an *interest* in monkeys = monkeys have an interest for me || I am *familiar* with that subject = that subject is familiar to me || Di D 213 the school... I was a little *strange* to it at first = the school was strange to me || we were *in sight* of the shore: Defoe R 2.212 we kept on in sight of the shore | the shore was in sight || Defoe R 2.199 I was exceedingly *sunk in my spirits* = my spirits were low (sunk), my spirits sank.

**11.5₄.** The substantive *value* is also double-faced: Tennyson L 1.262 let me have it back again, for I have some value for it [= it has some value for me]. This must probably be explained by a new verbal substantive being formed from the verb *value*. Other quotations are: Defoe R 2.362 himself, for whom I had a particular value | Fielding 3.485 by all the value and esteem he professed for her| ib 526 others who had a particular value for certain rings | Austen E 155 she had the highest value for elegance | ib 157 | GE Mm 233 he had a due value for the Vincy's house; similarly Cowper L 1.370. This is now obsolete. Cp. also: this thing has a pleasant *relish* | Di D 381 to have a natural relish for my dinner. This has a nasty *taste* | he has a taste for wine.

**11.6.** Sentences of the type "the path is easy to find"

are frequent in most languages. If we analyze this sentence logically, we see that it is not so much the path that is easy, as the finding of the path; if we transcribe: "it is easy to find the path", the subject in the first instance is *it*, which is representative of the following infinitive + object *to find the path.* Notionally, we may therefore say that in "the path is easy to find" *the path* is at once a subject and an object; but grammatically *the path* is treated as the sole subject, and *to find* as an appendage to *easy;* cp. Lat. *facilis inventu.* This analysis is confirmed by the concord of the verb: *the paths are easy to find* | *You are easy to deceive*, and by the possibility of using the adjective plus inf. as an adjunct: *the path, easy enough to find by day-time, was now quite invisible.* (11.64) Here we may say that the infinitive is used in a passive sense (it is well known that the infinitive like other substantives, was at first indifferent to the distinction between active and passive, PG 140, 172). Hence it is easy to understand that the passive form of the infinitive is sometimes used in these combinations (11.67).

**11.61.** Examples of the type: "the path is easy to find": Owl N 71 þu art lodlich to biholde | Ch Duch 526 thamendes is light to make | id E 850, G 606, HF 2.353 | More U 44 such an amiable reuerence, as was pleasaunte to beholde | Sh Merch I. 2.13 to know what were good to doe... teach twentie what were good to be done (passive, cf 11.67). | Sh Ro II.2.63 the orchard walls are high and hard to climbe | Cowper L 1.209 Very learned and very critical heads are hard to please | Tenn 56 The Gods are hard to reconcile | Thack P 43 the gloom of Bingley's face was fearful to witness | Ru C 52 People are perpetually squabbling about what will be best to do, or easiest to do | Hope R 130 His fortitude was good to see | Stevenson JHF 107 his face was so ghastly to see that I grew alarmed | Bennett A 146 his uneasy cheerfulness was painful to watch | James RH 266 She's worth coming barefoot to Rome, like the pilgrims of old, to see | Rose Macaulay P 47 the few girls who are jolly to watch when they run | Benson N 251 All this would be too long to set down in detail.

**11.62.** Thus also with a verbal phrase consisting of a verb + a preposition, where the formal subject of the sentence is logically the object of the preposition: this river is dangerous to bathe in | Spect 154 those who are hardest to come at | Fielding 4.390 an accident that might be grievous to me to think on | Di Do 230 the confidence is touching to think of | NP '25 rogues are fascinating to read about.

**11.63.** The same construction may of course be used where the adjective is the predicate-part of a nexus-object: Collins W 71 thoughts that made my position harder than ever to endure | Maugham TL 45 He was a half-caste, but even that amount of white blood made him possible to talk to | Merrick C 148 Do you find me so hard to talk to?

**11.64.** It will be convenient here to place similar examples, in which the adjective is an adjunct to a substantive, although these constructions like those in the preceding paragraph strictly fall outside the theme of this chapter ("Subject"): Goldsm V 1.105 A proper person is no easy matter to find | Di F 480 there are times when the hardest virtuous resolution to form is flight | Stevenson VP 123 A happy man or woman is a better thing to find than a five-pound note | Shaw D 50 It's not an easy case to judge | Galsw H 110 The Boers are a hard nut to crack | White N 114 Cranley was not a safe man to offend || Bunyan P 64 springs and fountains, very delectable to behold | Hope M 7 he owed my father a sum of money, too small to mention, but too large to pay | Housman J 47 he was a man difficult to know | Gissing H 267 an easy man to deceive, easy to make fun of, impossible to dislike, or despise || Froude C 3.232 Mrs. Carlyle, as well as her husband, was not an easy person to live with | Chesterton F 215 The little priest was not an interesting man to look at | Walpole OL 140 The world was a large place to be alone in.

**11.65.** The predicative to which the infinitive is attached need not be an adjective, but may be a substantive or a prepositional group:

AS Chron 1085 Hit is *sceame* to tellanne, ac hit ne þuhte

him non sceame to donne | Sh Ant V.2.305 that kisse Which is *my heauen* to haue | Mi A 51 What would be best advis'd... will not be *my task* to say | Swift J 226 Though this be *no jest* to tell, it was an admirable one to see | Stevenson T 211 with a certainty and a neatness that were *a pleasure* to behold || Goldsm V 1.191 Man little knows what calamities are *beyond his patience* to bear | Brontë J 391 That is *out of my power* to do | That is *not for me* to say. In the following quotation the prepositional group is an adjunct, cp. the constructions in the preceding paragraph: Phillpotts GR 29 from hidden causes quite *beyond human power* to explain.

**11.6₆.** The analysis given in 11.6₀ applies to the following sentences in which there is neither a predicative nor an adjunct to which the infinitive is attached: Sh Lr V.1.68 my state Stands on me to defend, not to debate | Shelley L 709 a nose which requires the utmost stretch of Christian charity to forgive | Thack P 37 His loyalty did his mother's heart good to witness | Hope R 225 the task which fell to his hand to perform | Bennett A 202 the astonishing fact, which takes at least thirty years to learn, that a Sunday-school superintendent is a man | Kennedy CN 133 he took a little time to cheer up | Kaye Smith HA 100 her marriage took much longer to unmake than it had taken to make | Helen Keller 292 They [books for the blind] cost a great deal to publish | Stevenson JHF 6 It sounds nothing to hear, but it was hellish to see | Thack H 97 the lad's face gave one pain to look at | Holmes A 50 these love dramas which make us young again to look upon | Lucas Roving East 11 No Indian bird gave me so much pleasure to watch as the kingfishers || Little remains to add (e. g. Rose Macaulay P 259).

Note the confusion in Sh Mids I.2.72 I will roare that *I will doe* any mans heart good *to heare me:* if Bottom had here omitted *me*, his sentence would have been of the type just exemplified; or he might instead of *I* have said *it* | Bunyan P 8 creatures that will dazle your eyes to look on them. — After *too* it is allowable to have and to omit *it:* that idea was too subtle for them to understand (it). The longer the construction, the more necessary it will be to add the pronoun: this

wood is too hard to pierce | this wood is too hard for me to attempt to pierce it | Benson N 273 the mysteries of it all are too great for me to attempt to pierce them.

**11.67.** I have already mentioned (11.60) that the infinitive may also be in the passive form; this however seems in most cases less natural nowadays than the active form: More U 33 suche thynges as shal be profytable to be knowne | ib 33 nothynge is more easye to be founde (other examples ib 64, 162, 235, 262) | ib 125 what numbre of haruest men is nedefull to be sente to them | Lyly C 288 That is easie without thy light to be found | ib 291 whether the report be more shamefull to be heard or the cause sorrowful to be beleeued | Lr III.3.11 'tis dangerous to be spoken | Swift J 68 money was so hard to be got here | id 3.208 this is not easy to be obtained | Defoe R 18 things that were needful to be understood by a sailor | id M 17 how hard he thought I would be to be gained | Stevenson M 33 things were hard to be distinguished | Hewlett Q 68 If men indeed had ever been so simple to be explained this world were as easy to manage as a pasteboard theatre | Gissing G 300 The reproach was merited, and not easy to be outfaced | Churchill C 44 an evil which was necessary to be borne.

Cp also: Bacon A 14.30 if hee thought it not fit to bee answered | Stevenson MB 147 good books. He did not think them easy to be read.

Note the confused construction (adv. instead of adj.): Mitford OV 30 Jack Rapley is not easily to be knocked off his feet.

Similarly with a verb + preposition: Sh Hml III.2.388 do you thinke that I am easier to bee plaid on, then a pipe? | Goldsm V. 1.139 money was never so hard to be come at as now | Lamb R 14 Margaret was old, and blind, and easy to be imposed upon.

**11.68.** The adjective to which the passive infinitive is attached, is an adjunct in the following quotations: More U 130 doores... so easye to be opened | Mi S 95 th'eye.. so easie to be quench't | Defoe G 31 with this short addition easily understood and not impossible to be acquir'd | Swift

3.289 a second word, much harder to be pronounced | ib 3.340 a root... difficult to be found | Austen M 67 the properest thing to be done was... | Scott Iv 381 there are things most necessary to be done | Di T 1.50 a man not desirable to be met, rushing down a narrow pass with a gulf on either side | Gissing R 257 a being perhaps impossible to be understood save by Englishmen.

Thus also with an infinitive followed by a preposition: Lamb E 2.187 a labour impossible to be got through.

**11.6₉.** Sometimes an ing is found in similar constructions instead of the inf.: Sh Hml V.1.100 Did these bones cost no more the breeding, but to play at loggets with 'em [cost to breed, did the breeding of these bones...] | Tro II.2.51 she is not worth What she doth cost the holding | Rose Macaulay P 48 How much longer will the peace take being made? In the last example the subject is really the ing-nexus *the peace being made*, in which the subject-part is in the common case *(the peace)* as in "The girl throwing him over has been a hard stroke" and other sentences quoted SPE XXV p. 168.

In some cases *of* + a substantive may be used in the same sense as the inf.: Stevenson B 194 the adventure appeared more and more difficult of execution | Wilde In 147 the intellectual ideal is difficult of attainment | Gissing R 29 any other ideal is easy of pursuit by the youngster.

## Object - Subject.

**11.7₁.** In sentences like "they were afraid of what they thought would follow" (spoken without any pause between *what* and *they) what* is to some extent felt by the actual speech instinct as the object of *thought* and at the same time the subject of *would follow*. This is shown by the frequency in such combinations of the form *whom* and by the possibility of having a relative clause without any pronoun, see 10.7₃ and 7.4₃.

**11.7₂.** Sometimes one and the same word may be the subject of one verb. and the object of another. This construction is of course disapproved of by all grammarians (e. g. Fowler KE 61). Examples: By D J 1.14 But this I heard her say, and can't be wrong | Thack P 2.221 all these facts gentlemen's confidential gentlemen discuss confidentially, and are known and examined by every person.

Examples are somewhat more frequent in relative clauses; an old ME one is Juliana 68 þi lauerd þet tu luuest ant shulde þi scheld beon (the other MS has: þat tu leuest on & schulde ði scheld beon). From modern times: Swift 3.342 another quality, which his servants had discovered in several Yahoos, and to him was wholly unaccountable | ib 343 from what he observed himself, or had been told him by others (pretty frequent in Swift) | Fielding 4.392 my wines, which I never adulterated after their importation, and were sold as neat as they came over | Di D 113 what a blank space I seemed, which everybody overlooked, and yet was in everybody's way | Chesterton F 213 a coloured window which he loved and always quieted his spirit | Locke GP 163 a one-seater... which you could learn to drive in five minutes and would do its fifty miles a gallon.

As a rule, a relative pronoun will be repeated when it has to serve these two functions, as in Seeley E 69 lands which James I never saw and which did not belong to him.

## Sentences without any Subject.

**11.81.** There are a great many sentences in which there is no subject expressed. The so-called impersonal verbs denoting natural phenomena could still be used in OE without any subject: *rinþ* like Lat. *pluit*, but already in the oldest period it became usual to add a neuter pronoun: *hit rinþ*, *hit þunraþ*, and in the modern period *it* is always required: *it rains*, *it thunders*, *it hails*, etc. A number of other verbs have passed from the so-called impersonal construction with a dative to the construction with a personal subject, see 11.2. A remnant of the old construction is found in *me thinks (methinks)* from OE *me þyncþ*, where we may still say that we have a sentence without any subject, unless we prefer saying that in such an example as Sh Err IV.4.157 "me thinkes they are such a gentle nation" the whole clause beginning with *they* is the subject of *thinks* = 'seems'. (Cf 17.94).

*It needs* has taken the place of an earlier *needeth* as in Ch A 462 But therof nedeth nat to speke as nouthe.

The subjunctive *please* is often used without a subject in the older language: *so please you*, *so please your honour*, *please God*, *an(d) please your Majesty*, etc. in Elizabethan authors; Swift T 43 An please your worships. But in the modern continuation of this usage *if you please* the popular speech instinct naturally takes *you* (the original dative) as the subject (in nominative).

**11.82.** A different case of a sentence without subject is seen in AV Matt 13.12 whosoeuer hath, *to him shall be giuen*—repeated in Gissing G 5 And to those who have shall be given. Similarly Marl E 2410 Champion, *heeres to thee* (said while giving a purse) | Swift P 148 *here's t'ye* | id T 65 *Here's to you* both with all my heart | Di Do 23 *Here's to you*, uncle Sol | London M 155 Well, *here's how*. In these last quotations the meaning is 'Your health!'

In Progr. § 213 I conjectured that *you* in *Here you are*, which is said in handing something to someone is an old dative, and that the phrase has taken the place of an earlier "Here you is".

Cp also the usual exclamation *Here goes!* (Troll B 390, Wells V 8, Benson D 290, Kipl 2.138, etc.).

**11.83.** The express indication of the subject (the second person) is generally superfluous with an *imperative;* therefore we find in English as well as in the cognate languages from the oldest times till the present day frequent sentences like these: Go at once, and don't come again! (earlier... and come not again!).

**11.841.** Nevertheless, a subject may be added, chiefly to give an emotional colouring to the imperative; often with some emphasis on the pronoun (and with a pointing gesture). In the earlier language the pronoun *(thou, ye, you)* was generally placed after the verb, thus in nearly all the OE examples collected by Wülfing I § 228. Further in Roister 52 If she despise you, een despise ye hir againe | Gammer 111 Do thou but then by my ad-

uise | Dekker G 54 but care not you for that | Greene FB 12.69 Madam Nell, never believe him you, though he swears he loves you | Sh Wiv II.2.277 Come you to me at night | IV.4.78 Feare not you that | Lr III.6.36 stand you not so amazd | Massinger N I.2.84 Nay, stay you, Alworth | Walton A 104 Go you to yonder sycamore tree | Scott A 1.122 No, no—stay you here and attend to Miss W. | Ru F 59 whatever the state does with its money, do you that with yours || Shaw StJ 14 Now listen you to me | ib 60 Then speak, you | ib 73 Speak you, Master de Courcelles (here evidently to give an archaic colouring to the style).

This word-order is preserved in a few set phrases: Walton A 104 *Look you* | Di Do 144 Look you, Ned, and you too, Walter (cp also *Lookee* < *look ye)* | Gay BP 142 Now as to me, brothers, *mark you* me | mark you, also, e. g. Kipl J 2.136, Ru CWO 22 | *mind you*, e. g. Hazlitt A 79, Ru CWO 59, Kingsley H 318, Stevenson VP 235. Cp also the obsolete *hark ye (hark' ee)*, *hark you*, frequent in Sh etc.

Sometimes a pronoun may be taken either as the subject or as the object (object of interest 14.4$_2$) of the imperative: *turn you* (ChE p. 105, below 16.8$_5$); thus even in Congreve 205 *Sit you down*, and especially in *fare thee well*, *fare you well.*

**11.8$_{42}$.** From about 1700 the tendency has been to place the pronominal subject before the imperative as before other forms of the verb: Congreve 199 you go to breakfast | Goldsm 624 never you fear | Beaconsf L 142 You try | Thack N 529 You hold your tongue | Di Do 223 But you keep watch till you hear me knock | Vachell H 118 you bet your life | Pinero Q 155 "Let me out". "Not I". "You let me out directly". | Zangw G 87 Never you mind.

Both word-orders combined: Galsw P 12.58 Come you, Chloe. And you, Rolf, you follow.

**11.8$_{43}$.** A compromise between the two word-orders is found when *do* or *do not (don't)* is placed before the pronoun: formally we thus have the old order, but the pronoun comes before the verb that matters: Roister 70 Do you that part wel play | Sh H4A II.4.32 do thou stand in some by-roome |

ib II.4.413 | ib III.3.25 Doe thou amend thy face, and Ile amend thy life | Oth IV.1.57 Do you withdraw yourself a little while | BJo 3.180 Do you two entertain Sir John | Bunyan P 208 do you go on before, I must stay awhile behind | Fielding 3.463 I do deny every thing, and do you find a witness to prove it | Sterne 40 and do you go directly for Dr. Slop | Goldsm 673 Do you hide yourself in that thicket | Scott Iv 141 and do you others let the fellow go | Di Do 435 then, said Walter, do you ask Miss Dombey where she's gone | Carlyle SR 151 do thou thyself but hold thy tongue for one day | Hardy L 160 Do you wait in patience [not now current coll.] Shaw Pur 68 Address me, sir; and do you, prisoner, be silent | ib 167 Do you speak with Cæsar every day for six months: and you will be changed.

Combined with *not:* Sh H4A I.2.69 Doe not thou when thou art a king, hang a theefe | Oth III.3.301 Do not you chide | Wint II.2.64 Do not you feare | BJo 3.56 but do not you forget to send now | Congreve 269 Don't you go yet | Sher 212 Don't you begin it, my love! | Lamb R 49 but do not you fear | Di D 117 Don't you be afraid, father | GE Mm 51 when he next comes and wants you don't you accept him | Harraden D 174 Don't you dare forget! | Shaw D 207 Dont you two begin to quarrel. — Unusual combinations: Shaw D 289 And do you, Hotchkiss, not despise this woman's soul | Rose Macaulay T 191 Anyhow, don't ever you get thinking that it won't hurt you.

**11.85.** The frequent omission of *thou* in questions (in ElE and later in archaic style or dialect) as in *Art mad?* = Art thou mad? was explained I.6.36 from the purely phonetic dropping of the weak vowel, after *th* had been assimilated to the preceding *t: art þu* > *art-te*, *arte* > *art*, etc. Examples: Gammer 104 *Art* deffe.. why *canst* not heares [= hear us] | 122 *Canst* not learn to-night, man? *Seest* not what is here? | Marl J 1930 *Wilt* drinke? | 1956 *hast* been in Malta long? | 1958 *Dost* not know a Iew? | Sh Gent III.1.390 Why *didst* not tell me sooner? | Lr IV.1.29 Fellow, where *goest?* | Cy V.5.110 *Know'st* him thou look'st on?

speak! *Wilt* haue him liue?... Wherefore *ey'st* him so?| Byron 572 *Art* sure of that? | Lamb R 11 *Dost* hear, girl? Why don't you answer? | GE A 2 *dost* think thee'st finished? | 7 *Shalt* go home | Bennett C 2.44 *Who'st* been running after? | Hardy R 27 *How'st* know [= how dost thou].

*Thou* is also sometimes omitted outside of questions; in some cases the same phonetic explanation may hold good, as the subject was often in early MnE placed after the verb when a subjunct, etc., preceded, thus Gammer 122 iche trust soone *shalt* [= shalt thou] it see | Redford W 500 and therfore *Shalt* have a new cote. But we find also an analogical extension of the use of these forms without any subject to instances in which *thou* would have preceded the verb; it should be remembered that forms like *canst*, *shalt*, etc., are the only ones which show with absolute certainty what the subject is; this, of course, facilitated the omission. Examples: Gammer 128 *Shalt* haue him at his chamber... *Shalt* see that | Sh Lr I.5.14 *Shalt* see thy other daughter will vse thee kindly.

**11.861.** Very often the subject falls out by what I have ventured to call *prosiopesis* (PG 310): the speaker begins to articulate, or thinks he begins to articulate, but produces no audible sound till one or two syllables after the beginning of what he intended to say. Not infrequently such clipped utterances become set phrases, in which no one misses anything. Thus *I* is left out in *Thank you* and *Pray* or *Pray you*, in ElE *prithee* for *pray thee*. In Sh Tp I.2.371 the folio indicates the omission by means of an apostrophe: No, 'pray thee. Beseech you. Further in *would* to introduce a wish: Sh Tp I.2.349 would't had bene done | Kipl J 2.15 Would I could get good from chewing branches! | Shaw D 287 Has Mrs. George taken a fancy to you? — Would she had! (Also: *Would to God...*).

Examples of other occasional omissions of the same order: Pinero Q 150 You don't approve of the engagement? — *Should think not!* | Kipl S 58 *'Never got* a sniff of any ticket | Norris P 332 *Wonder* what's become of him.

**11.862.** Very often the subject *God* is left unspoken in this way: Damn! | Confound it! | Beshrew! (Elizabethan also spelt beshrow in old eds.) | Sh Wiv II.2.160 'Blesse you sir | II.3.21 (and frequent) Giue you good morrow | Lr II.1.1 Saue thee | Kingsley H 286 Curse the boy! he's as mad as ever | Curle L 40 they wouldn't [respect him], curse them, and there was an end of it! *God* is probably the original subject in the phrase "Rest her (or his) soul" (e. g. Sh Hml V.1.147, Defoe G 35), though it is possible to take *soul* as the subject and *rest* as intransitive. In some of the phrases here mentioned it is possible to take *I* as the omitted subject: *I beshrew* is found once in Sh (LL V.2.46). If *God* is so often left out by prosiopesis, a concurring reason is the disinclination to name the word *God*, which is seen also in combinations where prosiopesis is out of the question, because *God*, if pronounced, would have come after the verb, as in *So help (me*, etc.), often mutilated into *S'elp*, *Swelp:* Chesterton F 126 he looked out for anybody, and, so help him, there had been nobody | London M 389 So help me, I'd be willing.

**11.863.** *It* is occasionally left out through prosiopesis: Kipl L 118 Strikes me that another dog went for a walk too | Gissing G 294 Sounds rather ludicrous, don't you think? | Ridge G 246 Seems to me, she said, you've... Thus also *may be*, which comes to be an adverb (*maybe*, dial. *mebbe*) | Stands to reason | Doesn't matter, etc.

**11.871.** Frequently more than the subject is left out in this way in colloquial speech, when the meaning is obvious: Glad to see you | Mc Kenna 310 Sorry. Let's talk of something else | Bennett T 80 Good-bye, old chap. See you soon | Norris P 294 Good-night, Sam. See you in the morning | Hope DD 76 Must you go? said I. — Yes; got a lot of things to do | Kipl L 83 Be hanged if I do | ib 229 Be damned if I do | Id S 189 'Shot if *I* would! | ib 154 'Fraid not | Bennett ECh 72 I can't tell it you all. Take too long.

*It* is left out in *Serves you right* (Kipl L 47, Hope FS 42). But in the frequent formula *Serve him* (etc.) *right* not only *it*, but the auxiliary *will* or *would* is left out: Di X 24 There

he is upon his head! Serve him right | Thack Hog 28 Serve you right for swearing | id N 769 when a scoundrel is whipped I am pleased, and say, serve him right | Rose Macaulay T 94 he may cut Amy's throat one day. Serve her right, the little cat | Shaw St J 62 we shall be defeated; and serve us right. Hence this formula is used even in speaking of the past: Thack N 12 I used to be flogged afterwards, and serve me right too | Shaw Ms 6 So the old girl got the sack; and serve her right! | id D 377 they caught him and burned him; and serve him right, too. But the preterit is used in Thack V 559 a husband—dead, (and served him right) these fifteen years | ib 560 he was shot—and served him right.

**11.872.** An auxiliary and the subject *(have you, do you, did you*, etc.) are dropped through prosiopesis: See? (e. g. Kipl L 97) | Doyle Sh 1.249 See that light among the trees? | Pinero M 52 Got any money with you? | Gissing B 145 Think so? | ib 347 Seen the Walworth's lately?... Meet anyone there? | Bennett T 465 Been looking after your mother? | Caine M 101 Taken the pledge, Dan? — "Have another cup" may be either the imperative or short for "Will you...?"

**11.873.** *Come to think of it* has arisen from *If you...* or *Now you...*, but may now, like some of the phrases mentioned already, be used in the interior of some utterance. Examples: Phillpotts M 11 Sam's clever enough for them both, come to think of it | Stevenson T 271 And come to think on it, it was like Flint's voice | Wells Fm 10 Come to think, it is just as you say | Bennett Hel 110 And Mrs. Prockter was no fool, come to think of it.

## Grammatical and Logical Analysis.

**11.91.** Sometimes we find a kind of conflict between the grammatical and the logical (or notional) analysis of sentences. In this chapter we have already dealt with some instances of this; others will be mentioned later, which we shall here anticipate in order to analyze them all together. I am alluding to such typically Modern English sentences as these:—

(1) he happened to fall (11.34),
(2) he was sure to fall (11.41),
(3) he was believed to fall,
(4) he was offered a reward (15.3),
(5) he was taken care of (15.7),
(6) he was spoken ill of (15.6),
(7) he was difficult to find (11.6).

In all these sentences, there cannot be the slightest doubt as to the grammatical subject: it is *he*. This determines the person of the verb, as seen by a comparison with sentences like *I happen to fall*, *I am sure to fall*, *I am believed to fall*, etc., in which the form of the verb is determined by the pronoun of the first person singular. But notionally *he* is not the whole subject. We cannot in the usual way ask: Who happened? Who was sure? Who was believed? Who was offered? etc. We must either complete these questions by adding *to fall*, or, in (4), *a reward*, and similarly with the other sentences, or else we must ask: What happened? What was sure? What was believed? This shows that the notional subject in the first three sentences is a neutral idea, namely really the nexus, in which *he* is the subject-part, and *to fall* the predicate-part. We may express this in an unidiomatic way by saying that the notional subject is *he-to-fall*.

In (4) *he* is the subject not of *was offered*, but of the whole combination *was offered a reward* (see 14.1), similarly in (5) not of *was taken*, which gives no sense, but of the whole combination *was taken care of*, thus also in (6) of *was spoken ill of*. In (5) and (6) *he* is the grammatical subject of the verb, but at the same time the notional object of the preposition at the end, and in the same way in (7) *he* is the grammatical subject of *was*, but the notional object of the verb *find*, while in the construction with a passive infinitive (11.67) "he was difficult to be found" *he* may be said to be the subject at the same time of *was (difficult)* and of *to be found*.

It is often said that what is characteristic of the constructions here mentioned is that they are personal, where other languages have impersonal constructions, and this is often (especially in Germany) inter-

preted as typical of English national mentality with its strong emphasis on personal character. This is not the place for a discussion of the question what conclusions with regard to national character may legitimately be drawn from syntactical phenomena; but I may be allowed to say that the rules of English syntax do not always here lead to "personal" constructions, see, for instance, sentences like "it happened to rain | the stone is sure to fall | the article was given the first place", etc.

**11.92.** Final Note to the whole Chapter.

Parts of this and the next chapters cover to a great extent the same ground as K. F. Sundén's big book "The Predicational Categories in English and A Category of Predicational Change in English" (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1916). Professor Sundén's book is mainly based on the material provided in the NED, and his classification and theory are intimately bound up with Noreen's system and the views of various German thinkers. I have preferred to rely on my own collections and to form my own conclusions independently of Sundén's, but the reader who consults his work will there find a great many useful supplements to my own grammar.

---

## Chapter XII.

## Object.

**12.11.** An object is a primary word (or word-group) which is intimately connected with the verb of a sentence, though less intimately so than the subject. After we have found the subject by asking the question Who, or What, with the form of the verb actually used in the sentence, we may proceed by asking Whom, or What with the subject and verb of the sentence. Thus, with regard to sentences like *She eats an apple every morning* and *The mystery puzzled us a great deal*, we find first by means of the first question (Who, or What, eats? Who, or what, puzzled) that *she* is the subject of one, and *the mystery* of the other sentence. Next, we ask: Whom, or What does she eat? Whom, or What did the mystery puzzle? and thus find that the two objects are *an apple* and *us*, while *every morning* and *a great deal* are not connected intimately enough with the verb to be objects: they are only subjuncts.

On verbs which take, or may take, two objects, see ch. XIV. On adjectives and adverbs (prepositions) with objects, as in "he is not *worth* his salt" and "*after* the war" see provisionally PG p. 163 and 87 ff.

**12.1₂.** If we compare instances in which the same verb is used intransitively, i. e. without an object, and transitively, i. e. with an object, as in

| | |
|---|---|
| she *sings* well | she *sings* French songs |
| I *wrote* to him | I *wrote* a long letter |
| *send* for the doctor | *send* the boy for the doctor |
| he doesn't *smoke* | he doesn't *smoke* cigars |
| he *drinks* between meals | he *drinks* wine, etc. |

(see 16.1), we see that the object serves to make the meaning contained in the verb more special, or to limit its sphere of applicability. But this, of course, is rather vague; and on the whole we must say that on account of the infinite variety of meanings inherent in verbs the notional (or logical) relations between verbs and their objects are so manifold that they defy any attempt at analysis or classification. One variety, however, stands out so clearly that it requires a separate treatment, namely the *object of result* (12.2). (German: ergebnisobject, or effiziertes object).

**12.1₃.** All objects other than those of result we shall here term *ordinary objects*. But it is worth observing that this class contains the most heterogeneous objects, and that neither the names given to these objects in German grammars (richtungsobject, or affiziertes object) nor the definitions usually given are comprehensive enough. I refer to such definitions as "the person or thing to which something is done" (Onions), "the receiver of the action" (Kittredge) or "the thing directly affected by the action" (Grattan), for while they apply to such examples as these: They *murdered* the chief | John *bought* a house | the girl is *plucking* flowers | the child *broke* his playthings | mother *cut* the pie, etc.—they cannot be applied to a great many cases in which there is no doubt that we have objects: in "the boy *saw* the moon" we must certainly say that the boy is more affected than the moon; cp further: they *left* London | she

*showed* courage | they *parted* company | we *run* a risk, etc., and see the lists given below, 12.4—12.6.

**12.14.** The case in which the object stands, is in those pronouns which have a case-distinction, the "oblique" case (*me*, *him*, *her*, *whom*, etc.) and in the others as well as in substantives the "common" case (*you*, *it*, *what*, *the man*, etc.). From the modern point of view it is of no importance whether the verb in question in OE took its object in the accusative or in the dative, as the distinction between the two cases was obliterated before the modern period; the object after such verbs as *help*, *follow*, *thank* (and French verbs like *please*, *obey*) is now on exactly the same footing as that after *beat*, *see*, etc., and we may even say the same of the object in combinations like *it stood me in good stead* or *he looked her in the face*, where *me* and *her* are the objects of the phrases *stood in good stead* and *looked in the face*. We shall speak of an "indirect" object only when there are two objects in the same sentence, and even then we shall have no use for the term "dative", see ch. XIV.

**12.15.** Sometimes it is difficult to draw the line between an object and a subjunct, and grammarians often differ on that point of grammatical analysis. If we remember that the main business of adverbs is to serve as subjuncts, we can in many cases be guided by the fact that most languages have separate pronominal adverbs: if, therefore, the word or word-group with regard to which we are in doubt, answers to a question with one of the interrogative adverbs *how*, *why*, *when*, *where*, we may take it that it is a subjunct, and only if it answers to a question with *whom* or *what*, it is an object, because *whom* and (an isolated) *what* are primaries. But *how much* may be both a primary (How much of the snow melted? | How much did he give?) and a subjunct (tertiary: How much better to lie down! | How much does he care for her?) Consequently we may sometimes hesitate whether to reckon such quantitative elements as answer to the question "How much?" among objects or among subjuncts.

While we have certainly an object in *he eats little meat* and consequently also in *he eats little*, it is usual to talk of adverbs (what I call subjuncts) in *he sleeps little* and *he does not sleep much.* If I call *two pounds* and *three years* objects in "it costs two pounds" and "it will last three years", my chief reason is that it is possible to say "it will cost you two pounds" and "it will last you three years", where it is most natural to speak of an indirect and a direct object (14.34), while we should take *you* as the only object if *two pounds* and *three years* were called subjuncts. But then we must also call *two pounds* in "it weighs two pounds" an object; and probably also *two miles* in "he walked two miles". Other doubtful cases will be dealt with in vol. IV under Subjuncts.

It is often said that it is possible to find out whether a given word is an object or not, by trying if it can be made the subject of a passive sentence, and it must be admitted that this test can be used in many cases; but even apart from the impossibility in certain cases of making an indirect object the subject of a passive verb, we shall see in ch. XV that this is no more an infallible criterion than any other single one.

Cf also 1.17, where *long* in "the wound took long to heal" was considered an object—chiefly because *take* generally takes an object. Transitional cases with *what* and *nothing*, which from being loose objects become subjuncts, are mentioned in II 16.52 and 17.36ff.

### Object of result.

**12.21.** This kind of object presents no difficulty and no particular interest in cases like these: The people *elected* a king | John has *built* a house | the girl *paints* flowers | the dressmaker *made* the dress | the child *wrote* a letter. The same kind of object is obvious after verbs like *produce*, *create*, *pronounce*, *construct*, *manufacture*, *develop* (a photograph), *beget*, *suggest*, etc.

**12.22.** But the chief point of grammatical interest is that one and the same verb may take both kinds of object without really changing its own signification, though the

relation between the verb and the object is entirely different; compare for example:

| | |
|---|---|
| I dig the ground | I dig a grave |
| he bores the plank | he bores a hole in the plank |
| she lights the lamp | she lights a fire |
| he painted the wall | he painted a flower on the wall |
| we burn coal | the cigar burnt a hole in the coat |
| he has eaten an apple | the moths have eaten holes in the curtain |
| hatch an egg | hatch a chicken |
| boil potatoes | boil soup |
| roll a hoop | roll pills |
| beat another boy | beat time (an air, a retreat) |
| strike the table | strike a bargain, fire |
| pick a flower | pick holes in an argument (Shelley 979 flaws in our close-woven happiness); pick a quarrel |
| conclude the business | conclude a treaty |
| sign a document | sign your name |
| spin a top (causative) | spin silk |

A curious mistake of the object of result for the ordinary object is found in the following sentence; Ru F 137 if coats are to be made, cloth must be provided; if oakum to be picked, oakum. Ruskin here forgets that *oakum* is what results from the picking of old ropes.

**12.2s.** One special case of the object of result is *to grope one's way* = 'to find (or make) one's way by (or while) groping'; similarly:

Poe 106 I scrambled my way through the evergreens | Spencer A 1.380 Carlyle never set out from premises and reasoned his way to conclusions | Shaw 1.202 I'll—er—er —[He stammers his way to the porch] | Bennett B 121 I dared not force an entrance | Lewis MA 256 This summer Pickerbaugh had shouted and hand-shaken his way through a brief Chautauqua tour.

Cp also: to work one's passage to America | Wells T 119 we had brought no money to bribe a passage north.

**12.24.** Another special case is found when a verb assumes the signification 'to express by —ing': Harraden D 33 she *laughed* her thanks | Austen M 78 Mr. C. *smiled* his acquiescence (also p. 232) | Shaw C 65 she smiled her thanks as she turned away | Tylor A 296 Savages and barbarians *dance* their joy and sorrow, their love and rage, even their magic and religion | Di D 193 *gesticulating* anything but welcome from the bow-window | Morris N 53 I *nodded* a yes | Quiller Couch M 189 Sir Cæsar nodded approval | Austen M 223 Mr. C. *bowed* his thanks | Hope R 178 they had withdrawn, bowing obedience | Norris O 292 Magnus *beamed* satisfaction | Housman J 331 the king *breathed* his astonishment | Mackenzie S 1.71 Michael could only *stare* his agreement | Jenkins B 53 he had *protested* his innocence. Cf *look* 12.64.

**12.25.** We have a related use in phrases like *work one's hardest*, where *one's hardest* may be described either as an object of result or as a subjunct. This is frequent with verbs which are otherwise intransitive: Carlyle SR 204 while the Beaconfire blazed its brightest | Trollope D 2.77 smiling her prettiest | Shaw C 187 they both looked their best | NP troops can never be expected to fight their best on empty stomachs. Cf II 11.38.

### Cognate Object.

**12.31.** The so-called cognate object — as in "the King lived *the life of an exile*"—is generally given as a chief division, parallel to the object of result; but in reality it is a subdivision under the object of result: "the life of an exile" is what resulted from his (manner of) living; cf also "he has fought the good fight," i. e. fought so as to produce "the good fight". These examples may serve to show also, that combinations of this kind are found with verbs that are otherwise intransitive (*live*) just as well as with verbs that are otherwise transitive (*fight*; cf "fight the enemy").

Many grammars give as examples sentences like "I dreamed a dream"; but (as I said in PG 138) I very much

doubt the occurrence in natural speech of such combinations; the object would be inane and add nothing to the verbal notion. In real speech this kind of object is used for one purpose only, namely to add a descriptive or qualifying trait, which could not conveniently be joined to the verb in the usual way as a subjunct; the use of a nexus-substantive as object enables us to give to the descriptive addition the convenient form of an adjunct (either adjective or prepositional group) instead of a tertiary member. Note that "to fight the good fight" is not the same thing as "to fight well" —there is really in the language no adverb corresponding to *good* in this sense. An analysis of the following set of quotations will show how analogous difficulties of expression are avoided by the addition of a substantival object:

Malory 104 the herte lepte a grete lepe | ib 694 she shalle dye the moost vylaynous dethe | Sh Oth V. 2. 122 A guiltlesse death I dye | Tp I. 1.72 I would faine dye a dry death | Cowper L 1.345 whether we die to-day or to-morrow, a watery death or a dry one, is of no consequence | ib 2.105 he lived the life, and died the death of a Christian | Ru Sel 1.243 I never saw a man die a violent death | Brontë J 189 she sighed a sigh of ineffable satisfaction | Di T 1.50 she said nothing, but coughed just one grain of cough | Troll B 503 she smiled a little smile and bowed a little bow | Bennett L 7 Miss Grig had smiled her wise, condescending smile | Bennett B 31 he whistled a low meditative whistle of satisfaction | Kipl J 1.109 Mowgli laughed a little short ugly laugh | id P. 171 The old man laughed one of those short Pict laughs—like a fox barking on a frosty night | id S 283 Abanazar laughed a little nervous, misleading, official laugh.

**12.3₂.** It will now be readily understood that the cognate object is often placed (by the author or by the compositor) outside the sentence, separated from it by a comma or a dash; it is thus, as it were, in apposition to the verb:

Di T 1.78 the eyes looked, not an every day or every night look, at monsieur | Bennett W 2.271 the dog sighed,

the insincere and pity-seeking sigh of a spoilt animal | Housman J 73 Then he smiled, a shy nervous smile | Ward M 123 Kitty laughed—a laugh musical but malicious | Galsw C 261 trying to understand. But he could only feel—confused and battered feelings, with now and then odd throbs of pleasure.

**12.33.** The grammatical phenomenon is thus shown to be parallel to the addition of a substantive with an adjunct in the form of an apposition to an adjective, the sense of which is repeated in the substantive, as in

Gissing G 335 the hills grew brighter and brighter — the brightness for which there is no name among colours | Ward F 121 her face was very pale — a greyish pallor | Bennett C 2.269 he had been too proud to ask — the terrible pride of the benefactor.

Not infrequently the addition is effected by means of *with:* Carlyle F 3.215 I am sick with a sickness more than of body, a sickness of mind and my own shame | She was pretty, with the prettiness of twenty.

**12.34.** In OE *eal his lif he lifde buton synnum* (Blickl. Hom.) = ModE *he lived all his life* (*his whole life*) *without sins*, we see as it were a cross between the cognate object and the substantival subjunct of time (length). But in *uton libban ðam life ðe scrift us wisige* (Wulfst.), *the life* is put in the dative of instrument or manner.

## Ordinary Objects.

**12.41.** A subdivision of the ordinary object is formed by what may be called the *instrumental object.* In OE *weorpan* 'throw' might take that which is thrown either in the accusative or in the dative (instrumental): *teoselum weorpeþ* 'throws dice'; cp also *hit hagalade stanum* 'it hailed [with] stones' | *he ongan wepan hluttrum tearum* 'he began to weep [with] pure tears' | *blode swætan* 'sweat [with] blood'; Wülfing 1.271. Similarly Old Norse had the dative with verbs meaning 'to throw,' etc.; in Russian *brosat'* 'throw' takes either the acc. or the instrumental. In English, in consequence of the formal identification of the cases, we have the common-case as an object; and in the case of such verbs as *throw* there is no occasion to separate the instrumental object from the ordinary object. But in the following in-

stances there is more reason for acknowledging a separate object of instrument.

**12.4₂.** Parts of the body: she *nods* her head | the dog *wags* his tail | he *snapped* his fingers at it | I only *shrug* my shoulders | Heywood P 901 *gnashynge* hys teeth | Di T 2.285 he *points* his finger | Hope D 81 pointing my forefinger at Hilary | Di T 2.237 he *beat* his feet upon the ground | ib 288 *stamping* her foot in the chair | Hope D 75 George beat his cane restlessly against the leg of his trousers | Huxley L 1.184 emphatically *striking* his hand upon his knee | Brontë J 273 Adèle will *clap* her hands | Scott Iv 406 the Grand Master *glanced* his eye slowly round the circle | Doyle S 1.105 taking the paper, and glancing his eye down it | Benson D 2. 178 the doors were not high enough to enable him to pass through them without *hitting* his forehead against the jamb | Galsw FM 230 he *drums* his fingers on the uncleaned pane | Locke GP 95 she *flicked* finger and thumb | Beresford R 85 Mr. Leaming snorted and *clicked* his tongue.

**12.4₃.** Other examples of instrumental objects: Sh As III, 4.44 Hee . . . *sweares* braue oathes | *play* cards | Bennett T 78 They *touched* glasses | Locke Ord 186 We *clinked* glasses | Galsw MP 54 James *wiped* his napkin all over his mouth | McKenna S 320 "Come along!" he said, *slapping* a cane against his leg | Wells PF 107 my hand was *dripping* blood | Burke Am 8 bidding against each other, until you *knock down* the hammer.

It will be seen that other constructions are often admissible with the same verbs: he *wiped* his mouth with the napkin | *slapping his leg* with a cane | blood was *dripping* from my hand | he *knocked down* the thing to the highest bidder. Cf. 12.5 ff. other verbs with double construction.

**12.4₄.** In many cases we may hesitate whether to use the term instrumental object or object of result: Sh Shr Ind 1.124 a womans guift To *raine* a shower of commanded teares | AV Luke 17.29 it rained fire and brimstone from heauen | Walton A 115 and 178 it rains May-butter [obsol.] = now: it rains cats and dogs | London V 221 the sky

rained cobblestones | Sh Wint V.2. 98 my heart *wept* blood | Cowper L 1.187 to have wept crocodile tears | Brontë V 111 I *cried* hot tears.

*Blow* in Goldsm V 1.54 we should never strike our unnecessary blow at a victim—may be called an instrumental object. Other more or less doubtful instances of instrumental object may be found in the list of verbs with different objects, 12.5—6.

**12.5₀.** The examples already given show how different the notional relations may be between a verb and its object. This is made even more clear when we see that the verbs derived from the two synonymous adjectives *empty* and *void* take two different classes of objects: *to empty a thing* = to make it empty; *to void a thing* = to emit it so as to make something else empty (cf *evacuate*, *vacate*). A still better illustration of the essentially vague and indistinct character of the grammatical category 'object' is found, when we see that a great many verbs take totally different objects with totally different significations.

The following lists do not pretend to be complete. An attempt has been made to bring together verbs whose relation to their various objects is similar; but it has not been possible thus to class all those verbs which can take different objects.

**12.5₁.** Pretty often one of the meanings of a verb may be the causative of another meaning (generally the usual one) of the same verb; cp 16.4₉ and the causative use of habitually intransitive verbs in 16.7.

*Enter* a house, a carriage | a legal right to enter his children in the primary schools (NED) | enter a name in a list.

*Walk* the streets, a hospital | Walk your horses.

*Spring* surprises on one | Defoe R 12 we had sprung a leak | Wells Ma 1.78 A pair of new stockings . . . sprang a bad hole as she put them on.

*Run:* run a race | run a risk | Stevenson D 271 she might run danger from some Cuban emissary [rare] | NP' 95 I ran that narrow shave of being buried alive [rare] | Stedman

Oxf 346 run the time as close as possible | run a horse, a business | they run few trains on Sundays.

*Sail:* sail the sea | sail one's course | London A 162 I sailed my own schooner here.

*Pass:* pass the bridge | pass an examination | we passed the time very agreeably | we passed the time of (the) day (=said good morning, etc.) | pass round this picture | Shaw P 193 May I pass?—Pass Apollodorus there! [= let him pass] | Philips L 96 I have been passing myself off as Mrs. Robinson | the Bill passed the House | the House passed the Bill.

*Weigh:* it weighs two pounds | weigh the pig | weigh one's words | weigh anchor.

**12.52.** *Marry:* the clergyman marries Mr. A. to Miss B. | Mr. B. marries his daughter to Mr. A. | Mr. A. marries Miss B. | He married her a year ago = he has been married to her for a year | Di Sk 475 a nephew who had been married about a year [= who had married a year ago] | Di F 837 I am going down to marry her.—Not to marry her myself, said Mr. Milvey [a clergyman], with a smile, because I have a wife already. To perform the marriage service at her wedding | Stevenson B 365 if he is to marry, marry him in the name of Mary, and be done! | Locke GP 33 You're always thinking of marrying me off | Kaye Smith HA 17 marry money . . . you ought to get married at your age, and you might as well marry for the family's advantage . . . I married directly my father died. Cp Marl J 1031 To marry with the daughter of a Iew.

**12.53.** *Fight:* they fought the enemy | they fought many battles | MacCarthy 2.73 a series of actions was fought by Sir Colin | fight the good fight, cf 12.31 | people do not fight cocks nowadays.

*Possess* something | possess one of a thing, whence the more usual passive: he is possessed of this = he possesses this; Sh R 3 III. 1.196 all the moueables Whereof the King, my Brother was possest. A special usage is the Shakespearian *possess one of* = 'inform one of'.

Sh also has *remember* = cause to remember, remind (H 4A V. 1.32) and *fear* = cause to fear, frighten; cf 16.6₂.

*Confess* a crime | confess a person = hear his confession.

*Eat:* US (NED) I can *eat* you and *drink* you, but I can't *sleep* you.—Cp *dine*, etc. 16.7₉.

*Graze:* Mi (NED) flocks grasing the tender herb | Swift 3.322 whether the field I graze her [a cow] in be round or square. *Graze* 'touch lightly' may be the same word.

*Inherit:* he inherited a large fortune (a taste for music) from his father | Tennys 55 Our sons inherit us | Sh R 2 I. 1.85 It must be great that can inherit vs [= put us in possession] So much as of a thought of ill in him. Orig. 'make heir'.

*Smell:* I smell a rat | Sh Meas III. 2.195 she smelt browne-bread and garlicke (in this sense now always intransitive with *of*).

**12.5₄.** A related modification of meaning is that corresponding to the prefix *be-*, especially as used in German:

*Hang* curtains, criminals | hang the walls with pictures | Hope Z 62 every house was hung with red | Shaw J 130 I hate diamonds; only Teddy insists on hanging me all over with them.

*Plant* a tree | plant the garden with shrubs | Mi SA 1734 there will I build A monument and plant it round with shade Of laurel.

*Sow* grass | sow a plot of ground with grass.

*Sing* a song | Tenn 68 wheresoever I am sung or told in aftertime.

*Clap* one's hands (12.4₂) | Mackenzie C 68 She danced . . . everybody *clapped* her so loudly.

**12.5₅.** This leads to the following verbs which mean various ways of giving, and which may take both the person to whom something is given, and the thing given, as their objects:

*Pay* the driver | pay five shillings | pay the bill, one's debts. Cp 14.2₁.: pay the driver five shillings.

*Furnish* the room | we furnish everything you want |

we furnish you with everything you want | Benson A 11 exertion furnishes them with amusement | Brontë W 39 I'll furnish them a reception.

*Entrust:* we entrusted him with our money | entrust a task to a person | Macaulay H 1.211 it was not thought safe to entrust to them the King's intention.

*Trust:* I could not trust him | Byron 582 I trust them with you—to you | De Quincey 278 he would not trust his safety with the French clergy | Bennett HL 151 she wanted to trust herself to him | Hope R 38 it was a great risk for Rupert to trust himself in the kingdom | Eastw 483 she will not trust us another meale (obs.). (Trust in the Lord, to the Lord).

*Present* the young ladies with flowers = present flowers to the young ladies.

*Familiarize:* the war familiarized us with the rationing system | Defoe M 240 time . . . familiarises the place to them | Buxton Forman in Keats 5.74 Morris's Poem has familiarized to English readers one variant of the legend.

*Provide:* We provide everything (for our customers) | provide someone with money. In Sh also with two objects: Wiv V. 1.6 Ile prouide you a chaine, and with *of:* Merch II. 4.24 I am prouided of a torch-bearer. Cf. 13.2*7*.

*Supply* the necessary money | supply him with the necessary money. NED has examples of s. sth *to*, 1704, 1827.

*Serve:* Bennett C 1.98 one of the women served him with beer = served beer to him.

*Find*, besides the usual meaning 'to discover what has been lost', may mean 'supply something to some one' and 'supply someone with something': finding paupers in venison (NED).

*Feed:* feed the dogs with bread and butter | Lewis MS 20 a graham cracker which she feeds to a baby | Kuhl, Philol. Quarterly 1923, 303 the Prioress naturally would not feed that bread to her puppies | Galsw SS 38 [an American speaking:] They ought to feed him oxygen; it must be sleepy under there [him = the Speaker in the House of

Commons]. Wells Cl 45 what is fed to us | 675 You can feed the public anything you like. Cf 16.6₂.

*Issue* a man with a rifle (= furnish; used in the army, according to Prof. A. Mawer) | issue rifles to the men | issue orders.

*Wrap* her in the cloak | wrap the cloak round her.

*Don* a garment | Brontë W 169 He was donned in his Sunday garments (very rare).

*Help*: so help me God | help yourselves to bread and butter | Austen T 423 help her on with her gown |Ward R 2.171 Robert helped him on with his coat | Poe S 79 we helped Augustus off with his clothes || Kennedy CN 55 Kate was helping soup from an enormous tureen | Jerome (NED) I want a spoon to help the gravy with || Hope R 194 don't fire if you can help it | Ru C 27 they will never work if they can help it, or more than they can help | she burst out crying; she could not help herself | Shaw J 127 I cant help my husband having disagreeable relatives.

**12.5₆.** With the opposite idea of depriving one of something we have similar double constructions:

*Rob* a person of his clothes | they robbed everything he had (now less common).

*Filch:* they filched his money | London A 344 He had been filched of something that he felt was almost his.

*Strip*: they stripped him (also with nexus-object: stripped him naked) | Carlyle (NED) the guests all stript their coats. On the intransitive-reflexive use see 16.2.

In the army it was usual during the great war to say *the men were evacuated*, instead of *the camp was evacuated*; cp above on *empty* and *void* 12.5₀.

**12.5₇.** The following verbs with more than one kind of object (persons and things) present some points of similarity with those in 12.5₅. *Ask* questions | ask one's way of a passer-by | ask a passer-by to show one the way | he asked him many questions | ask him about his intentions | What did he ask for the gloves? | you might ask him to dinner | ask him to come. Cf 14.9.

*Beg* a favour of one | I beg your pardon | this is begging the question | beg him to come.

*Beseech* him to come | Locke St 246 beseeching an interview | Thack (NED) the wretch besought him for mercy.

*Question* a person (*on*, *about* a thing) | question the veracity of an author | Sh Oth. 1.3. 129 [He] question'd me the storie of my life (obsol.)

*Answer* a letter, an invitation, a question, the bell | answer the teacher | he answered nothing; what should he answer? Cf 14.9, 15.5.

*Envy:* they envy you | they envy your beauty | they envy you your beauty 14.9$_1$ | they envy you for your beauty (Keats 5.183).

*Address:* He addressed me | he addressed himself to me | he addressed a few words to me.

*Impress*: Di T 2,246 impressing him with the truth = impressing the truth on him.

*Excuse:* he excused himself | nothing can excuse his behaviour || excuse me | he was excused from attendance | Farquhar B 334 we'll excuse your waiting [= e. you from waiting], cf 14.9$_3$.

*Oppose* the government | oppose a vigorous resistance to the enemy.

*Inspire* confidence | God inspired the writer.

*Invite* one's friends to tea | Murray Trans. Philol. Soc. 1877. 569 I am able to invite a visit from any of our members.

*Advise:* I advised him (to stay) | I advised peace.

*Counsel:* Morris (NED): he has neither sense to counsel himself nor to choose counsellors for himself, much less to counsel others | Caine C 136 it is easy to counsel patience.

*Threaten:* he threatened his enemy | he threatened his life | it threatens rain (instr.) | he threatened her out of her money (nexus obj.) | Dickinson R 13 threatening a material heaven.

*Drink:* to drink wine || to drink one's health, cf Di N 160 punch to drink happy returns in | Di D 751 I will drink all happiness and success to you | Mered R 22 he wanted to

drink his birthday | Pinero B 207 we'll drink luck to each other | Di Do 28 we'll drink him | Di Ch 118 you've drunk the Labourer | Kipl M 193 they drank the Queen. — In these cases, the object is the "sentiment given", which originally has no connexion with the verb *drink*, as when some one says "Let us drink(.) 'Your health!' "—Cf also above 12.53 under *eat*.

**12.61.** There are other verbs with two kinds of objects which seem to defy classification.

*Call* (out) the names | call a taxi | call me at six | he called his boy John (nexus-object) | he called John names | let me call your attention to these matters . . . Let me call these matters to your attention (in one and the same article NP '17).

*Fix* one's eyes on a thing | fix a thing with one's eyes (Examples in NED from Mad. D'Arblay, F. W. Robinson, Mrs. H. Ward); thus also Browning 1.407 Those deep dark eyes . . . Fixed me a breathing-while or two | fix a day | fix the fountain-pen (in US = 'repair', etc.).

**12.62.** *Join:* AV Matth 19.6 What therefore God hath ioyned together, let not man put asunder | Brown joined the Club | join issue.

*Lay:* lay the cloth on the table for tea | Galsworthy P 2.42 the missis told me to lay the tea | ib 44 let Rose lay the table . . . Rose lays the cloth | Stevenson M 163 a table laid for supper | Bennett W 2.272 the servant came in to lay the supper . . . as she laid the table | Galsw IC 231 while Warmson laid the fourth place.

**12.63.** *Play* cards (instr. 12.41) | play one's highest card | play bridge, tennis, etc. | play the game | play the violin | play Beethoven | play many roles | play one's part well | play tricks | play a good knife and fork (caus. or instr.) | Austen M 107 we play but half-crowns. (On *play* with predicative see 17.43.)

*Represent:* the picture represents the king | he represents the university | it represents the best British traditions | he represented the importance of conciliation to his audience.

**12.64.** *Look:* from the construction with a predicative (17.55) we have by insensible gradations: Di M 11 those strange creatures who look their oldest when they are very young (cf 12.25) | Mered E 102 he looked the fool he was very soon to turn out to be | Thack H 19 he looked quite the genteel thing | Austen M 121 she looked the part | Di Do 318 he looked his character to perfection | Merriman S 176 some of them were young although they hardly looked it | Shaw D 23 Ive such a wretched digestion, and I look it | he looked all wonder (cf 12.24) | Austen M 263 she looked the astonishment she felt | Tenn 100 looking ancient kindness | Wells T 22 the gaunt face looked interrogation | Trollope D 3.170 looked daggers at everyone (cf Sh Hml, below, 12.67) | Shaw P 47 She looks unutterable reproach at him [also Kipl L 143] | Di D 37 we all said something, or looked something to welcome him | Carlyle R 1.60 he would say and look pregnant things about Napoleon.

A different use is found in the expression 'to look somebody [orig. dative] in the face':

Stevenson V 8 you have only to look these happy couples in the face | GEA 403 to look painful facts right in the face | Wells TM 61 I could look my circumstances fairly in the face | Kipl J 1.22 Mowgli looked at him between the eyes . . . not even I can look thee between the eyes || Di X 14 he looked the phantom through and through | Hope Z 98 he looked me up and down.

We have various obsolete significations of *look* with an object in: Ch C 578 Looketh the Bible [= see] | Sh Alls III. 5.115 I must go looke my twigges [= look to] | Dryden V. 381 I was looking you [= expecting].—With the last compare Di X 18 look to see me no more; and look that you remember what has passed between us | Kipling L 88 he congratulated himself upon his cunning, and looked that the evening would bring him a great reward.

**12.65.** *Turn:* turn the handle | turn the leaves of a book | turn a wheel | turn one's back to the fire | turn a deaf ear to what he says | turn prose into verse | turn one's sen-

tences well | turn a corner | fear turned her pale (nexus-obj.) | (turn traitor, see 18.2₅).

*Part:* Sh R 2 III, 1.3 Since presently your soules must part your bodies (obsolete) | he parted his hair carefully | they parted the two fighting rivals | to part company (e. g. Doyle St 15).

**12.6₆.** *Wait:* Tim I. 1.161 waite attendance | Sh LLV 2.63 wait the season (now generally with *for*) | Austen M 32 waiting the final arrangement by himself (also M 35, 152, where also *for*) | Scott Iv 68 without waiting the Jew's thanks | Brontë P 8 as if waiting our entrance (ead. J 273) | Di N 175 he seemed to be only waiting her directions | ib 700 to wait an answer | Hardy F 102 they waited the fulfilment of their anticipations | Hope Z 60 a group of officers stood waiting me | Kipl L 163 waiting their turn (frequent) | Kipl J 1.69 Wait my coming | Shaw 2.62 you shall wait my pleasure (frequent) | Wells V 287 waiting only his chance || Di D 323 I found my aunt up, and waiting supper [= waiting with supper] | Ward E 502 Meanwhile Eleanor and Reggie waited breakfast on the loggia | Bennett C 1.275 we aren't to wait dinner for him | Kaye Smith GA 4 I'm middling tired of waiting my meals for them boys.

*Stay* = 'wait' is rare with an object: Sh R 2 I. 3.4 The Duke Stayes but the summons (but ib 7 the champions stay for nothing but his Maiesties approach) | Goldsm V 1.24 he was prevailed upon to stay supper | Austen M 302 ask him to stay dinner | ead P 424 an invitation to stay supper (not in PE).

**12.6₇.** *Think*: Sh Ado III. 2.14 what his heart thinkes, his tongue speakes | Ro III. 1.109 I thought all for the best | R 3 I. 3.51 Cannot a plaine man liue, and thinke no harme | Lamb R 11 folks will think harm of it | Henley B 62 I thought no harm | Barrie MO 91 do you not think shame? | he thinks nothing of drinking a whole bottle of port | Bennett A 168 She thinks all the world of you (the same phrase without *all* in Walpole DF 33, Churchill C 303) | Kennedy CN 85 She thought the world and all

of him | he thinks much of you. In these last examples we certainly have an approach to subjuncts, if not actually subjuncts; cp "he thinks highly of you".

*Speak:* speak French (cf Trollope D 1.33 chatter Italian) | Ruskin Sel. 1.389 do not silence the peasant because he cannot speak good grammar | this speaks volumes for his sincerity (subjunct of measure?) || Sheridan 244 my future life should have spoken the sincerity of my gratitude (cf 12.24) | Hope C 272 his eye spoke his admiration of her || Dekker F 237 thou . . . shalt speake oracle | Sh Hml III. 2.414 I will speake daggers to her, but vse none | Mi S 248 The deeds themselves, though mute, spoke loud the dooer | Brontë V 309 that swart, sallow, southern darkness which spoke his Spanish blood || Darwin L 1.229 On the 10th we spoke the packet Lyra [common nautical expression: 'hail a ship'].

*Talk:* Sh Lr III. 4.162 Ile talke a word with this same lerned Theban | Shelley 179 You talk Utopia | Pinero S 58 he talks England | Stephen L 224 we are talking baby from morning till night | Wells Ma 1.248 they talked more ideas and less gossip than is usual with English clubmen | Bennett C 1.251 People talked theology | Locke FS 119 When she came and talked sick-room platitudes | ib 129 we talked books, art, travel | Masef W 56 Can you talk gipsy yet? Cf 17.31.

Cp Bennett ECh 293 she would *gabble* nineteen to the dozen in private with other girls—object, or subjunct of measure?

The difference between *he speaks English beautifully* and (the more usual) *he speaks beautiful English* is that in the former the adverb qualifies the composite idea of *speaking English*, while in the latter only the sb *English* is qualified by the adjective. Defoe G 121 to write good English . . . to understand good English . . . to write or spell true English | ib 130 not one in ten of them that write bad English, write it so bad as I do. [Here one would now prefer: . . . *as badly as*].

### Object after Substitutive Verbs.

**12.7₁.** It is possible to have an object even if there is no verb, if the verb is easily supplied in the same form from what immediately precedes: Cambridge breeds men; Oxford, Oxford men [= Oxford breeds Oxford men] | Zangwill G 62 he shakes me like a terrier a rat.

**12.7₂.** But if a verb is necessary for some reason or another, it is often convenient instead of repeating the same verb to use either *do* or an auxiliary verb, which then may take an object, even if it would not be possible for this substitutive verb in itself to take the same kind of object.

With this use of *do* with an object compare F *faire* in Mérimée Col. 232 Don Juan regretta don Garcia plus qu'il n'aurait fait son frère; OF examples e. g. in Aucassin et Nic. 14. 16 and 19; cf Diez, Grammatik III, 415 Littré *faire*. (But it is also possible to use *à:* Mérimée l. c. 205 piquez-le comme vouz venez de le faire à l'autre). The English use is not due to French influence, for it is found from the oldest time, see Sweet AS Reader XIVa 158 biddende þæt hē hire sunu on Godes naman ārārde, swā swā he dyde wydewan Drusianam. ME examples: AR 54 ne seið hit nout þ heo behold wepmen; auh deð wummen; ib 56 | Judith 94 | Chaucer C 27 I made hir to the worshipe of my lord; So do I alle myne othere creatures; ib E 1039, F 557, G 1328, H 132, MP 3.892. Mandev 102, 168.

**12.7₃.** Modern English examples: Malory 83 the dethe of this damoysel greueth me sore. So doth it me said Balan | More M 55 ryche men brynge not vp the yonge ones of greate catell as they do lambes | ib 131, 195, 250 | Sh Oth I. 1.155 Though I do hate him as I do hell paines | Sh Cor V. 4.16 He lou'd his mother dearly.—So did he mee | Walton A 27 he never reproved these as he did the scribes | Defoe G 45 I must interrupt you, as you did me | Spect 7 he remembers habits as others do men | Darwin L 2.74 allow you all to make continents, as easily as a cook does pancakes | Doyle S 6.101 He impressed me as being a perfectly honest man. So he did me.

We have *do* after an auxiliary verb, where this would have sufficed in itself: Sh Tw II. 5.60 telling them I knowe my place, as I would they should doe theirs | Defoe R 2.57 they would shoot them as they would do ravenous beasts | By DJ 7.37 he measured men as you would do a steeple.

**12.74.** Substitutive *do* is not often found with an indirect object. Dekker F 1512 Will you commaund me any seruice, as you haue done Orleans? | Defoe Rox 163 I had told him my opinion of matrimony in just the same terms as I had done my merchant | Bennett W 1.166 Doesn't it give you a funny feeling . . . ? It does me. | Maxwell EG 402 Mums gave her a more expensive education than she ever gave me. Generally *to* is inserted: Earle Phil 555 In common parlance we give a writer the credit of his rhythm, as we do to Milton; cf already AR 342 ich habbe tobroken ham ou [them (to) you] ase me deð to children.

*To* is even found where the full verb if repeated would never have *to* (cf F *à* above, Dan. *göre ved*): Defoe Rox 80 I had a sight which confounded me at once, as I doubt not it would have done to any woman in the world | Di T 2.44 she let him go—as a cat might have done to a mouse.

**12.75.** Objects are found after auxiliary verbs like *will*, *shall*, etc.; cf ON (Wimmer's Læsebog 49) ver þú eigi meir baki lyptingina, en ek *mun* stafninn.

*Will:* Ch A 4085 Lay down thy swerd, and I wil myn alswa | Lyly C 278 as hee tendreth vertue, so he will you | Sh H 4 B IV. 2.63 Discharge your powers . . . as wee will ours | Sh John II. 1.402 Turn thou the mouth of thy artillery, As we will ours, against these saucy walls | Fielding T 3.68 this encounter surprised the ladies much more than it will the sagacious reader | Mered R 147 even if my father forgives my birth, he will not my religion.

*Would:* Sh Cor II 1.10 to deuour him, as the hungry plebeians would the noble Martius | Kingsley H 232 she fondled it in her arms as a mother would a child | Di D 244 it may not surprise you, so much as it would a stranger | Ru Sel 1.364 count its stones as you would jewels of a crown.

**12.76.** *Shall*: Ch E 1454 each of hem sholde helpen other In meschief, as a suster shal the brother | id D 1532 | Sh H 4 A V. 3.9 This sword hath ended him, so shall it thee | Mackenzie C 177 I shall always love you . . . So shall I you.

*Should:* Sh R 3 I. 3.148 We follow'd then our lord, our soueragine king; So should we you, if you should be our king | Tw II. 4.112 | Hughes T 2.231 I can't expect a man to have his head clear at such a moment.—Not a man perhaps, but I should a ghost | Trollope D 1.168 I am able to congratulate you as a father should a son.

**12.77.** *Can, could:* Ml E 599 I loue him more Then he can Gaueston | Fielding 3.534 I despise you as heartily as you can me | Defoe R 150 I could no more stir the canoe than I could the other boat | Twain M 168 Well, you can do me a good turn, and so can I you.

*May, might:* Ch B 397 [She] Recyveth hire with also glad a cheere, As any mooder myghte hir doghter deere | Sh Oth I. 3.294 She ha's deceiued her father, and may thee | Kingsley H 228 jewels which she had been fingering over as a child might its toys.

Cf also Mi PL 9.842 a garland to adorne Her tresses, and her rural labours crown As reapers oft *are wont* their harvest queen [= as reapers often do their h. q.].

**12.78.** *Have* (= the perfect of the verb it supplants): More M 288 they haue aswel preserued theire owne citizens . . . as they haue their enemies from the furyous rage of theyre owne men | Sh Tw I. 3.97 I would I had bestowed that time in the tongues, that I haue in fencing | Defoe R 2.337 we bound them as we had the other | Goldsm 676 if she makes as good a wife as she has a daughter | Thack H 109 What business have you to ruin an English gentleman as you have me? | Phillpotts M 25 he flung the message into the fire, as he had a thousand like it.

**12.79.** In the following sentences something more than an infinitive is 'understood' after *be* (*ready to serve*, etc.): Thack H 124 the footmen were as ready to serve her as they were her own mistress | Huxley L 1.243 I am quite as ready

to admit your doctrine that souls secrete bodies as I am the opposite one that bodies secrete souls | Hope Q 50 they'll be just as ready to manage your soul for you as they are your property.

## Object after Auxiliary Verb.

**12.81.** The only objects the auxiliary verbs *can*, *may*, *must*, *will*, *shall* can take in ordinary modern language are infinitives (without *to:* I can sing, etc.); cf 12.7ff. on their use as substitutive verbs.

**12.82.** Still there are some remnants of the old use, in which these verbs had a fuller meaning than nowadays and therefore could take a noun or a pronoun as object. *Can* originally meant 'know', as still in Redford W 499 Ich can my lesson (cf 1.31). In Sh we find the combination *I can no more* (e. g. Hml V. 2.331) and Tp IV. 1.27 the strongst suggestion Our worser genius can.

**12.83.** *Will* is used in a similar way in Sh Wint I. 2.19 Ile no gaine-saying | H 5 IV. 1.32 And then I would no other company. (This of course is different from the fully inflected verb: *he wills*, *willed*, which naturally takes an object).

**12.84.** In recent times we have the combination *(I) will* (*have*) *none of* (quotations II 16.683); further *What would you?* (e. g. Hope R 64; in Sh several times). Besides, a strongly stressed *that* may be used as the object of one of these auxiliaries: Swift T 65 That you shall | Swinb PB 220 Can I forget? yea, that can I, and that can all men | Hope Z 165 would he kill the king? Ay, verily, that he would | Maxwell Ch Night 53 Get back to your good little wife as fast as you can.—I will that. But instead of "What can he?" colloquial English now always has "What can he do?" Note however *which* as the object (referring to an infinitive) in Benson B 53 to see whether he [a dog] could catch it [a water-rat]—which he could not.

**12.85.** For want of a better place I mention here a few instances of a pronoun placed first as objects of phrases which do not regularly take an object, but a preposition: Mi SA 424 this I am sure | ib 1408

Yet this be sure | Di Ch 161 That I am determined | Ward El 253 What did she expect? Not any of the things which the vulgar bystander expected — that he was certain. In such cases the writer probably had at first another continuation in mind than the one he finally chose, or he began his sentence without having framed it completely in his mind.

---

## Chapter XIII.

## Verbs with Object or Preposition.

**13.0.** A great many verbs can be constructed either with an object or with a preposition (plus its object). In the latter case we may say that the object is governed by the whole composite phrase consisting of the verb and the preposition. The meaning of the two constructions is sometimes identical or nearly so, but in some cases there is a marked difference, and not infrequently the preposition serves to make the whole expression more graphic. A complete treatment of this subject would fill a whole volume, and the reader must be referred to the big dictionaries to supplement the following remarks.

I have taken a few remarks from Bøgholm, *Engl. Prepositions* (Copenhagen 1920) p. 76ff.

### About.

**13.11.** *Mind* in the sense 'object to' generally has an object, as Sher 292 you need not mind stopping between the acts | ib 293 Don't mind interrupting them. But George Eliot very often says *mind about*, as M 1.243 the lambs would not mind so much about being petted | Mm 230 he did not mind about being considered poor.

*Know* (a thing, a person) presupposes a more intimate knowledge than *know about* (= know something about). Cf. *know of* 13.4. Thus also "I had *forgotten* his promise": "I had *forgotten about* his promise"—the latter expression is looser and more vague than the former.

*After* see below 13.2.

## Against.

**13.1₂.** *Fight* the enemy, *fight against* the enemy: no marked difference.

*Offend* a person 'hurt his feelings'; *offend against* law, tradition, people's feelings = 'do something that runs counter to law', etc.

## At.

**13.1₃.** *Catch, grasp, strike, clutch* and similar verbs take an object, when the accomplished action is to be expressed, and *at*, when an attempt is meant; cf. also *guess* a thing, guess at a thing; *point* out a thing, point at a thing (also with the implement as the object, above 12.4₂) and, though this is not an exact parallel: to *get* the apples; we must use a ladder to get at the apples. *To fire* a gun, to fire at the enemy. Cf. also *curse* someone, Swift J 209 cursing at him | Pinero BD 60 I'm only a widow! Everybody is entitled to stab at me | Mason F 101 he could not conjecture at the particular cause (for the more usual *guess*) | Swift J 300 I admired at your impudence (rare, from *wonder at*, but *wonder* cannot take an object).—*Envy at*, sometimes in Sh.

*Visit* friends, a house; also *visit at a house*: Di D 530 I would ask their permission to visit sometimes, at their house. *Visit with* implies mutuality, as in GE Mm 10 the small group of gentry with whom he visited | McKenna SS 123 she's given up visiting with the Rodans | Norris P 142 almost every evening the girls came to visit with the Cresslers (chiefly U. S.).

*Play* used to take *at* before the names of games, but now it generally takes an object (see 12.6₃):

Austen P 98 she did not play at whist | Lamb E 1.58 they do not play at cards, but only play at playing at them | Tenn L 3.215 play at Dummy Whist | DiDo 235 play picquet . . . play backgamman . . . Carker plays at all games . . . I play chess a little | Stedman Oxf 101 play cards or billiards every night | Kipl J 2.180 to play ball | Ridge S 82

the guests played dominoes. But: the children play at soldiers [= represent soldiers in their play]. Further: he played *with* his fork, with life | to play *upon* words. Cf below under *for* 13.2.

### For.

**13.2₁.** When *for* is used after a verb which may also have a simple object, it generally means: 'with a view to obtain'. Thus in Thack N 552 *to draw for more money*, where now it would be more usual to say *to draw more money*. Also after *try* in Austen M 313 *to tell you what he was trying for* | ib 382 *I can never cease to try for her.*

Cp the similar use of *for* after *care* (which cannot have an object); here it alternates with *about:* Butler W 82 he might have been happier than he was if he had cared about things which he did not care for. — Cp also *look for, long for.*

*Wish* has several constructions. Besides two objects (I wished them a pleasant journey 14.3₁) and a nexus-object (I wish it undone | they wished us to be particularly careful) it can have a simple object and *for*: Dryden 5.388 I should have wished it | some one who wishes to see you | Poe 25 (poet.) Eagerly I wished the morrow || Defoe R 314 This was what I wished for | Goldsm V 2.129 those who wish for an union | Churchill C 313 Cynthia did not wish for a dress. Cognate obj.: Benson D 16 I wish all the best wishes that my nature can desire and my brain conceive, both to you and him.

*Covet* something (chiefly with a religious colouring); obsol. with *after* and *for*: Sh H 6A V 4.146 coueting for more.

**13.2₂.** *Hope* governs an infinitive with *to* or a whole clause, but otherwise it generally requires *for*: I hope to be able to do it | I hope you will come | DiDo 297 how can that be hoped for? | Austen M 313 I must hope better things [also 320, rare] | We have nothing to hope for from him (this would be awkward without *for*. See on the etymology *Language* 390. *Die Sprache* 293).

**13.2$_{3}$.** *Want* (cf 16.9$_{2}$) has different meanings. When it means 'to require or desire', it has a simple object. When it has the (probably more ancient) meaning 'not to have, to be destitute of' it is frequently, but not always, combined with *for*. In Sc the distinction is said to be strictly observed between *I want a thing* in the first, and *I want for a thing*, in the second signification. Sh only once has *want for* (Tim. III 2.10 hee cannot want for money, = 'be without'); everywhere else a simple object in both significations. Other examples of *want for*: Defoe M 34 she bid me take care of my health and want for nothing [but ib 12 Betty wants but one thing = 'there is only one thing she has not got'] | Goldsm V 1.165 she . . . does not want for parts (often in G. without *for* = 'not have') | Fielding 5.562 your Honour wants for nothing at home | Austen M 264 you do not want for fortune | Austen E 20 a home that wanted for nothing | Carlyle R 1.103 we never wanted for instructive and pleasant talk while together | Thack N 320 he did not want for abilities (also, Brontë, Di, Caine, Hewlett, Jerome etc.)

Note the somewhat different meaning in Quincey 79 when I wanted about as much of my fifteenth birthday as now of my seventeenth. It wants ten minutes to nine (old-fashioned).

In the sense 'not to have' a frequent expression is *to be wanting*, always with *in*, as Austen M 26 the parsonage had never been wanting in comfort | DiDo 229 | GE Mm 11 we are wanting in respect to mamma's memory | McCarthy 2.437.

*Lack* has the same constructions as *want*, but it never has the meaning 'to wish, desire'. Sh never has *for*, and the construction with an object is the only one mentioned in the NED (besides the obsolete *lack of*); but *lack for* is by no means rare:

Thack N 170 they lacked for nothing | Morris E 109 though they lack for show | Haggard S 29 you will not lack for means | Whittier 441 That none might lack . . . For bread and clothing | Rose Macaulay T 88 children . . . he must let them lack for nothing | Churchill C 342 she never

lacked for words || Chambers Hamlet 23 Sidney is curiously lacking in the characteristic Elizabethan blitheness.

**13.24.** *Ask* (cf 1257, 14,9) is often used with a preposition (*for*, *after*): Stevenson JHF 36 I don't ask that; I only ask for justice; I only ask you to help him | Doyle S 1.184 at last he asked a thing which I could not give. He asked for Alice | Benson D 139 I asked so affectionately after Dodo [i. e. asked for news about D. or her health].

*Beg* (cf 12.57). Various examples: Sh Hml III 4.172 Ile blessing begge of you | As II 3.31 would'st thou haue me go and beg my food | Mids III 2.109 Beg of her for remedy | Defoe R 112 begging of God to give me repentance | ib 318 they begg'd their lives . . . and begg'd hard for their lives . . . Atkins fell upon his knees to beg the Captain to interceed . . . and all the rest begg'd of him for God's sake that they might not be sent to England | Brontë P 18 to beg additional aid | Poe 297 Now let me beg your notice to the highly artificial arrangement | Troll B 430 I must beg of you to go back | Stevenson D 18 I beg you to lend me your arm . . I beg of you to be my escort | Collingwood R 116 apologetically begging (as other sons beg money) for time | Mered H 431 Lady J had not expressly begged of her to remain | Wilde P 27 I would gladly and readily beg my bread from door to door | Wilde D 177 I beg of you to do this.

*Crave* pardon | Maxwell ChNight 180 the human instinct which craves darkness for certain acts | *crave for* (or *after*) drink.

*Seek for* is now rarer than the simple *seek* (Maxwell ChNight 112 she was seeking her clothing in the darkness), except perhaps in the passive participle: Hawthorne Sn 44 Unsought-for, undesired, had come the fame which so many seek.—Old examples: More U 192 seke for thine own commodities | Sh Hml I 2.71 Seeke for thy noble father in the dust.

*Search* with a simple object means 'go through in

order to find something': they searched the room, the drawer | they searched for the secret documents.

*Wait, stay*, cf 12.66.

**13.25.** *Think:* in the comparatively rare *think for* there is no trace of the original meaning of *for* 'in order to obtain'. It seems to be found only in clauses of comparison after *than* and *as*, where it has probably arisen in analogy of phrases with *hope: more than you would think for*, cf *more than you could hope for;* in both cases the rhythm of the sentence seems to require something after the verb, and *of*, which is so often found after *think*, is not quite appropriate here.

Goldsmith 670 if you don't find Tony a more good-natured fellow than you thought for, I'll give you leave to take my best horse | Austen E 11 she will miss her more than she will think for | Meredith H 265 they would repent it, and sooner than they thought for.

*Play:* Austen M 107 we play but half crowns. Nowadays *for* would be required: we only play for halfcrowns.

**13.26.** *Fear* someone = 'be afraid of', *fear for* someone = 'be anxious on behalf of someone'; but Shakespeare still uses *fear* with object in the latter sense; he has also the reflexive construction *I fear me.* Sh Hml IV 5.123 [the King to the Queen]: Do not feare our person | Phillpotts M 193 Avisa did not fear her son, but feared for him.

**13.27.** *Provide* sth = 'procure and give' (above 12.55); *provide for* = 'provide [sth] with a view to': provide for the entertainment of the guests; also with a personal object: he has not provided for his children. Troll B 149 fourteen unprovided babes [= not provided for].

*Prepare* sth (what one intends to do): prepare an attack; *prepare for* sth = 'prepare oneself (or everything) in case sth should happen, keep oneself ready': prepare for an attack.

Thus also *arrange* sth, *arrange for* sth.

*Allow for*, see 13.4.

*Stand for* is American, where British has a simple object

('endure'): Lewis MS 420 I've stood for your sneering at this town . . . I've stood for your refusing . . . I've even stood for your ridiculing . . . But one thing I'm not going to stand: I'm not going to stand my own wife being seditious | London M 328 the slaves won't stand for it.

From.

**13.3₁.** *Escape* from prison | we cannot escape from death. Escape a person, escape his attention, his eye, escape suspicion.

*Depart* (from) this life | Eastw 476 to depart my obscure cottage (obsol.).

*Flee* the country, more often than *from* (*out of*) the country.

*Refrain* with an object is rarer than *refrain from*: Congreve 268 I can't refrain tears | Fielding T 2.52 Allworthy could scarcely refrain laughter at this.

*Expel* and *dismiss* in the passive may leave out the preposition: Hughes T 2.71 to be expelled the University | Mered T 154 the general might have official influence to get him expelled the city | he was dismissed (from) the school, dismissed the ship.

In.

**13.3₂.** *Share* something and *share in* have very nearly the same signification 'to have (get) a share of'; but *in* cannot be used when *share* means 'to give a share': he shares everything with his brothers.—Di D 39 sharing in these transports.

*Indulge* has a simple object in the meaning 'gratify or humour a person', or 'gratify an inclination', but takes *in* when it means 'to gratify one's (more or less luxurious) appetites freely' (short for *indulge oneself in*, see 16.2₂), but the distinction is not always observed: Bunyan P 47 indulge the flesh | Fielding T 1.64 the stipend . . . would hardly have indulged the schoolmaster in the luxuries of life | Austen M 398 indulge a hope of . . . | Shaw D 52 indulging

the well-known passion of cruelty | Mulock H 2.237 Halifax might indulge me with the society of his children | I generally indulge in a cigar after dinner.

*Believe* some one | I don't believe a word of it | I believe this to be true, that this is true. I *believe in* God, in ghosts, in votes for women. In AV both with *in* and *on*: John 10.42 many beleeued on him there | ib 11.25 hee that beleeueth in me.

## Into.

**13.3₃.** *Enter* a room = enter into a room; cf 12.5₁.

*Penetrate:* the eye penetrates the darkness | he penetrated their designs | we penetrated into the forest, through the desert | he is thoroughly penetrated with his subject.

*Examine* a person, a piece of needlework (look at it attentively); *examine into* something (investigate, hold an enquiry): Austen P 210 she examined into their employments | Huxley L 1.224 I must examine into a good many points for myself | Ru U 48 If you examine into the history of rogues . . . by examining one or two instances.

*Investigate* correspondingly (cp *look into*).

## Of.

**13.4₁.** In some cases, where we find a verb both with and without *of*, the preposition has the meaning 'concerning' (as in *speak of sth.*). *I have heard of it* therefore is vaguer in meaning than *I have heard it*; *I know such men* presupposes a more personal knowledge than *I know of such men* (cf *know about* 13.1₁): Di F 125 Do you know them well?—I know of them | Gissing H 247 do you know her?—Know of her, that's all | Swinb L 64 I should have known of it before now, if I were ever to know it at all | Stevenson JHF 228 tell me your name, and of your nature [awkward].

Cf also *unheard* (he was condemned unheard) and *unheard-of* (nearly = 'unexampled').

*Boast* now generally has *of* (or *about*) or a content-clause, formerly also a simple object: Brontë V 359 loqua-

cious in boasting the triumphs of feelings. This construction is still found when the verb means 'to be proud of possessing': he boasts the name of . . .

The preposition had the same meaning in *consider of*, which is now archaic: Lyly C 301 till I haue further considered of this matter | Sh Mcb III 1.76 Now haue you consider'd of my speeches | Defoe R 312, 2.80 | Franklin 146 | Austen M 286 | Di D 516 I had better take a week to consider of what he had said | Ru U 48 We will consider of this presently.

*Remember of* is exemplified in the NED (4b) from 1386 (once only in Sh., H 8 I 2.190) to 1851, but in the 19th c. it is only found in Sc; elsewhere *remember something*. The frequent phrase *put someone in mind of sth* (e. g. Sh R 3 IV 2.114 to put your grace in mind of what you promised me | B Jo A 4.310 he puts me in minde o' the widow)—seems to be due to *remind someone of*; one would expect rather: put sth in the mind of someone or put me that in mind. An unusual form is found in Lamb E 1.54 The blast . . . puts me in thought of death.

A similar case is *repent*, which is now rarer with than without *of*. Sh has both constructions, and moreover the reflexive (Mcb II 3.112 yet I doe repent me of my furie), which is like the French construction, but has now disappeared.

*Treat* or *treat of*. In the latter case *treat* is constructed like *speak*, *discourse*, *write*, and has the same meaning as these verbs. Moon (Dean's Engl. 99) gives the example: "A matter treated of in my former paper was treated by you with indifference." *Treat* some one, something has a much wider scope than *treat of* and generally requires an adverb of manner: *he treated her cruelly*. Cf also: "I treated the children to some ice and cakes".

**13.4₂.** In other instances, when we find a verb with object or with *of*, the latter has a partitive sense. *Partake* with obj. in the NED is defined as 'to take a part in, to share in , and (rare) 'to share (a meal)', with *of* (also, rarer, *in*)

as 'to take a part or share in some action or condition', 'to receive, get, or have a share or portion of, to take some of, take of, take', and 'to have something of'. The difference is not always very clear. A few examples will suffice:

Johnson R 74 to partake of your conversation | ib 95 they often courted her to partake their pleasures | Byron 660 Partake his punishment | Di D 161 shrimps, of which he had been partaking.

*Taste* something = 'perceive it by the sense of taste'; *taste of* especially 'eat or drink a little of', or 'have (some little) experience of', as in Austen M 329 she had tasted of consequence in its most flattering form | Keats 5.156 whether I am destined to taste of happiness with you. (In another sense *taste of* means 'produce a taste like').

Here, I think, belongs the rare *miss of*: Bunyan G 36 make me miss of Heaven | Franklin 97 we could not miss of having some morality | ib 128 I should not miss of a reward. Now only with a simple object.

*Fail* takes an object (orig. dat.) in the sense 'not to render due service': his heart (eyesight) failed him | here again chronology fails us; also (with a personal subject) in the sense 'be without' (now rare): I fail words to repress my contempt. This candidate lacks too many marks and therefore fails the whole examination. Further, in the sense 'omit to perform' and 'be unsuccessful in trying' it takes an infinitive with *to*: he failed to keep his word | you scarce can fail to match his masterpiece (NED). But in the latter sense it has (or had) sometimes *of*, as in Austen P 138 my proposals will not fail of being acceptable.

*Provide of*, see 12.5₅.

**13.4₃.** *Desire* now has a simple object (not *for*) or an object and an infinitive (I desired him to know), or an object and *of* (a person); it is no longer used as in Shakespeare: *desire* a person of something: Merch IV 1.402 I humbly doe desire your Grace of pardon, or: desire a person to (a place, = 'invite'): H 5 IV 1.27 Desire them all to my pavillion.

*Entreat:* he entreated them to stay | Johnson R 86 he entreated their stay | Swinb L. 74 do, for my sake, I entreat of you.

Cf. *ask*, *beg* 13.24.

**13.44.** *Accept* in Sh more frequently with a simple object than with *of*; the latter construction was formerly frequent, but is now nearly obsolete:

Ml F (1616) 1497 accept of these forty dollars (also 1503) | Bacon A 10.16 to accept of us as his true servants | Mi SA 1460 | Defoe P 94 if he would accept of that lodging | Franklin 29 I accepted the invitation . . . accepting only of a pot of ale | Austen S 242 those who will accept of my love | Scott Iv 28 they accepted of feudal offices | Di D 154 I begged Mrs Micawber to accept of them as a loan . . . a service I will thankfully accept of.

*Admit:* in the signification 'let in' always without prep.; = 'allow, acknowledge, concede' nearly always as in Austen M 141 the last scene admitted a good deal of action; but sometimes *of* (NED examples from 1649 to 1828 Scott). In the sense 'be compatible with' it used to have a simple object (still archaically in Tennyson, NED), but now has *of*: Fielding T 4.220 my case admitted of no comfort | this admits of no other explanation. In the sense 'confess (to having)' (not in NED) it may have *to*: Haggard S 240 I admit to a natural shrinking.

*Allow* generally has an object, but when it means 'to accept as reasonable', or 'to permit the occurrence of' it often takes *of* (NED 4b, 10, also Haggard S 72). Wilde W 9—10 She allowed of no compromise. I allow of none . . . You allow no exceptions. *To allow for* = 'to make allowance for' (as a modifying circumstance).

*Permit* generally with an object; sometimes with *of*: Doyle S 5.144 the circumstances did not permit of any striking illustration of those powers.

**13.45.** *Approve* and *disapprove* take an object or *of* without any definite distinction, the former always in Sh:

Franklin 117 Those disapprov'd his doctrine | ib 126

I did not disapprove of the design | Austen S 16 approve him | ib 17 disapprove your sister's choice | ib 80 Mrs Smith disapproves of it . . . she does disapprove the connection | Trollope D 1.110 if you know what my Lord approves of and what he disapproves . . . if you mind what he approves, or disapproves | McCarthy 2.624 a war of which the English Government approved | ib 625 to defend the policy which he had never approved | Mackenzie S 629 Of course I approve of him. No one could accept a refusal so wonderfully without being approved.

*Like of* is obsolete: Defoe R 319 I told him my project . . ., which he lik'd of wonderfully well; also id M 290. (Cf. on *like* 11.2₁).

Other obsolete *of*-combinations are seen in Sh Lr II 4.241 What should you need of more? (on account of the sb. *need*) | Congreve 148 I can't hit of her name. Cf. also Franz § 513.

One reason for the frequency of the concurrent use of object and *of* after verbs is probably the use of that preposition after verbal nouns (especially in *-ing*) and adjectives (e. g. *desirous*).

**13.4₆.** *Turn* (cf. 12.6₅) may have *of* in the phrase *be turned of* = 'have passed the age of': Lamb E 1.29 I was of tender years, barely turned of seven | Carlyle R 1.164 Graham was turned of fifty when I first saw him | Hope C 271 I am but turned of fifty. Most people would say: I am but turned fifty, without the *of*.

**13.4₇.** Besides the construction (we shall) *make him our enemy* we have also: *make an enemy of him.* Carlyle H 179 as if Napoleon had been made a King of, not gradually, but at once. *He was made a fool of* ('treated as a fool', cp. *made fun of*); "he was made a fool" would imply that he actually became a fool. Similarly Sh Alls I 1.7 You shall *find of* the King a husband, Madame, you, sir, a father (also Merch III 5.89, Cæs. II 1.157).

**13.4₈.** *Let go* often takes an object: *the ship let go her anchor.* This of course is a case of an "accusative with

infinitive"; the old word-order is seen in Ch HF 2.443 "he lat the reynes gon Of his horse", and still in Di D 44 "she let mine [= my hand] go"; but the prevalent word-order is as old as 1530 (NED): Fielding 4.391 softly letting go her hand. Now, however, *let go* is often construed with *of* (the oldest ex. in NED from 1851), as if "one's hold" were understood, or as if *go* were taken as a sb, or simply through influence from "take (get) hold of". The first two examples show both constructions: Hewlett O 45 she did not let go of the child . . . she kissed him again, and let him go | London W 81 the unknown had let go its hold of him . . now that the unknown had let go of him | Kipl L 242 let go of my wrist | Hope M 361 Yet he did not let go of his prisoner . . . Why don't you let go of my arm? | Caine P 19 Let go of me, will you? | Other examples Swinb L 223, 244, Ridge L 137, Hope R 301 (let go of them, but ib 304 she let it go), Benson D 2.239, Galsw TL 265.

Analogously we get also *leave go of*: Wells N 428 Leave go of her | id H 112 | Doyle S 3.101 Leave go of me!

With *hold* the construction without *of* is quite exceptional: London V 440 to take hold the stables.

### On, upon.

**13.51.** *Call*: will you call me at six please | the chairman called on Mr X (to open the discussion) | I called on him (= paid a call; cf *wait on*; Thack P 13 he likewise left cards upon Lord P.)

*Attend* a lecture, etc. | the ladies attended (on) the Queen. Various significations, with no clear distinction between the use with simple object and with *on*. Mary Shelley F 34 caught the scarlet fever . . . refrain from attending upon her . . . She attended her sick bed. Cf *to* 13.6.

*Touch* a thing (also, rarely, touch one's finger to the bell); *touch on* a topic (cf speak *on*, etc.).

*Remark* a thing 'notice'; *remark on something* 'make some (critical) remark on'. Dreiser F 148 being so absent-minded that her parents remarked on it.

*Ponder* generally has *over*, *on*; but sometimes a simple object: Brontë V 174 No need to ponder the cause | Hewlett Q 129 she sat pondering the book | Locke St 18 She pondered many things.

**13.5₂.** *Enter* (see 12.5₁); *enter on* = 'begin to speak on', Shaw D 58 the temptation to enter on an argument; also: he entered on his Professorial duties (NED).

*Begin* a thing, writing (to write) a book; he has begun on a new book. Hope In 101 she sat down and began on her soup | ib 135 she began on her letter [= b. reading].

*Commence:* Lamb E 73 when my friend commences upon one of those solemn anthems.

*Sound* the trumpet, also as in Tennyson 98 sound upon the bugle-horn.

*Play* the piano; play (something) on the piano.

*Improve* a thing = 'turn to account', 'make better': improve the occasion | this soap will improve her complexion; *improve on* a thing = 'produce something better than': we cannot improve on nature. Kaye Smith T 215 He'll let his designs be improved upon . . . You'd never improve these 'ouses into anything decent.

Similarly *refine*, *refine on*.

*Operate* = produce: *operate a change;* U.S. also = 'run': *operate the telephone*, *a manufactory*, etc.; *operate on* = 'perform a (surgical, etc.) operation on'. But, according to Mencken AL 199 "More and more, surgeons report that they operate a patient, not *on* him". (From German?)

*Jar* generally has *on* (the ear, the senses), rarely a simple object: Byron 645 since that saying jars you.

**13.5₃.** *Resolve* has a simple object more often than *on*, as in Carlyle S 86 as if he who can fly into heaven, could not also walk post, if he resolved on it.—(Cf to be resolved on, to be determined on).

*Decide* (*on*).

*Prevail* generally has *on* ('succeed in influencing') or *with* (which is rarer now than formerly); formerly it might take an object in the same sense (NED from 1475 to 1834,

among others Fielding); the NED has no example of the signification of my second quotation: Hawth Sn 76 the miserable sinner was prevailed with to mount into the air | Norris O 213 A Sunday repose prevailed the whole moribund town [both quotations are American].

*Spy* a person = 'discover'; *spy on* (also *into*) = 'keep watch on': Stevenson D 41 it is disquieting to find our acts so spied upon.

**13.5₄.** *On* added to a verb of action very often denotes the uncompleted work (thus also in Danish, where *på* serves to make verbs 'imperfective'): Lamb R 15 *On* a landscape . . . she had now been *working* for three months | Symonds Shelley 94 Shelley *worked* steadily, during the summer of 1817, *upon* his poem of Laon and Cythna (also *work at*) | Lowell 336 Musing much, all the while, as she *darns on* a stocking.

Cp also *grasp* (*on*), *seize* (*on*), where the prep. has approximately the same value as *at* above, 13.1.

Sh Lr I 1.255 Thee and thy vertues here I seize vpon.

### Over.

**13.5₅.** *Watch* a person, keep under observation; *watch over*, be careful about: Brontë V 349 You need watching, and watching over.

*Ponder over*, see 13.5₁.

*Tyrannize* with object is obsolete, now with *over*: they were tyrannized over by the big boys.

### To (cf 14.8).

**13.6₁.** Some verbs which formerly took or could take *to*, now take only a simple object, such as *obey* (cf F. *obéir à*). Inversely *listen* (*hearken*) now requires *to*, while formerly it could have a simple object: Roister 84 | Sh Cæs IV 1.41 Listen great things | John III 1.198 listen to the Cardinall | Tp I 2.122 [he] hearkens my brothers suit.

**13.6₂.** *Smell* something (I smell a rat); *smell to:*

apply one's nose to: Marl E 755 smelling to a nosegay | Mitford OV 72 (a dog) smells to flowers.

*See* a thing; *see to* 'take care that something is done'.

*Approach* 'to come near' takes *to* or (now more commonly) a simple object (cp the use or omission of *to* after *near*). It may also be used causatively = 'approximate; bring nearer', though not in present-day speech: Scott (NED): he approached to the fire a three-footed stool.

*Attain* and *attain to* a position; the latter calls attention to the effort required to get so far.

**13.63.** *Answer* (12.57) in various related meanings takes different objects, and in most of the cases may have *to* (see NED): answer (to) me; answer (to) a question, now generally without *to*; answer me this question. Sh Mcb IV 1.60 Answer me to what I aske you (obsolete) | he answered never a word (to us, to our question) | he answered her never a word | he answered my objections | answer the bell, the door | answering love for love | the dog answers to the name of Jip | I answer alone to Allah for my motive | it answers his expectations, his purpose, to the description of Strabo (but obsolete, not mentioned in NED: Austen P 51 they knew many women who answered this description).

*Attend church, school, lectures*, etc.; (where the corresponding sb is *attendance*); *attend to one's* work, affairs, etc. (where *attention* is the corresponding sb): *Are you being attended to?*

*Lecture:* he lectured to a large audience on Molière | NP '18 Bennett lectures to us, but he does not lecture us (the latter expression implies direct admonition or reprimanding: he lectured John severely on his behaviour).

*Trust* 12.55.

**13.64.** *Witness* a thing = to be witness (eye-witness) of, see; *witness to* = give testimony to: Wells T 112 all that this man said witnessed to the disorder of the party.

*Attest* (*to*) something. *Certify* (*to*). *Testify* (*to*). *Swear*

*to* (something one has witnessed), but *swear fidelity, eternal friendship* (relates to the future, = 'promise').

*Confess* and *confess to* are not always easily distinguished, though the former implies a more direct or formal acknowledgment. The latter for instance in Shaw D 50 no vivisector confesses to a love of cruelty | ib 101 Confess to a failure | I confess to being proud of it.

Similarly *admit* and *admit to*: I must admit to feeling proud; also (rarer) *acknowledge*: Mason F 170 I do not acknowledge to any mistake in this matter.

*Own* with object = 'possess', 'acknowledge as one's own', with *to* = 'confess': Di D 236 you won't mind owning to it | Conway C 260 she remembered more than she would own to | Archer A 10 bias for bias, I would rather own to that of the romantic schoolboy | ib 28 I must own my gratitude to the fierce individualism of the present. Less commonly *he owned being beaten*; before a clause no *to* is used (cf 2.73): *he owned that he had been there.*

*Pretend* with an object (also inf. with *to*, or clause with *that*) = 'put forth (falsely)', 'profess falsely': *pretend illness*, etc.; with *to* = 'make suit for': *pretend to her hand*, or 'lay claim to, profess to have': Congreve 115 I don't pretend to honesty | Johnson R 116 many who pretend to an exact knowledge.

**13.65.** *Stick:* by the side of the older *stick to* 'to cleave to, be constant to' this verb in quite recent more or less slangy parlance takes a simple object in the signification 'stand, endure'. This is not yet recorded in NED 1916, but is frequent in Galsworthy, Bennett, etc. Galsw WM 165 He could never stick that! He would have to clear out (id Ca 452, FM 196) | Bennett P 74 I can't stick the way he walks across the hall (ib 37, PL 181 LR 233) | Rose Macaulay P 184 Oliver couldn't stick him | Walpole SC 375 I don't believe I can stick that flat much longer | Wells JP 695 Our men at any rate will stick it. — Differently: he sticks *at* nothing (= has no scruples).

## With.

**13.71.** In *fight with* we might say that there is a kind of remnant or after-effect of the old meaning of *with* 'against' (G. *wider*), but generally *with* in most of the combinations to be mentioned here has the meaning 'together with, in conjunction with', cf above *visit with* 13.13); in *tip with* it expresses the means (cp *trust with* 12.55), and in some phrases the meaning is blurred and nearly obliterated; in *do away with*, etc., it resembles the use in "Off with his head!"

*Fight:* Walpole DF 368 I was not fighting with an evil devil . . . I was fighting myself.

*Cope* now always takes *with* = 'fight with', but formerly it could take a simple object, e. g. Sh Lr V 3.124.

**13.72.** *Advise* a person = 'give him advice'; *advise with* = 'consult'. Di Do 248 with no one to advise her—for she could advise with no one without seeming to complain against him.

*Consult* a person = 'ask advice of him'; *to consult with* a person = 'to consider in company'. The patient consults the doctor; one doctor consults with the other (Krüger).

**13.73.** *Meet* very often has *with* (from the idea of being together with), thus already Ch C 694, 713; Mandv 47; formerly *meet* a man and *meet with* a man seem to have been used indiscriminately; now *with* is not used when the meeting is by appointment, *meeting with* always implies a more or less accidental meeting, *with* being also necessary before the name of something impersonal (an accident, etc.), cf on the other hand *meet a bill*, *all claims*, *objections*, which implies power. A few examples (though unfortunatly not quite conclusive):

Austen M 99 he has met with great kindness from the chaplain | ib 105 that true delicacy which one seldom meets with now-a-days | ib 368 he had met with some acquaintance [accidentally] | ib 371 on the ramparts . . . it was her public place: there she met her acquaintance | Di D 60 a latent hope of meeting with some of Mr. P's

family | Haggard S 44 he had met with a great trouble . . . I know that there are curious forces in Nature which we rarely meet with, and that, when we do meet them, we cannot understand.

*Join* a club, etc. "*Lord C joined with Lord W in supporting the bill*" denotes that the two were joining forces. *Lord C joined Lord W in supporting the bill* means that Lord C has Lord W for his leader" (Bøgholm).

**13.74.** *Marry* (cf 12.52) and *wed* sometimes take *with* or *to*: Greene F 10 if thou wed with me . . . if thou wed thyself to me | Tennyson 114 They two will wed the morrow morn . . . To-morrow he weds with me.

*Congratulate:* there is a rare combination in Swift P 7 I congratulate with my dear country.

*Tip* is now constructed like *pay*: I tipped him half-a-crown; formerly with *with*: Swift J 42 I tipped his porter with half a crown (also Farquhar B 327).

*Stamp* (see 12.42): Sh Cæs II 1.244 [you] impatiently stampt with your foote.

*Bear* (injustice, insults, etc.) to a great extent has given way to *bear with* (e. g. *Eastw* 417 Beare with our willing paines | Benson D 2.38) she has borne with it [her husband's conduct] like a cheerful lion | we must bear with him in his silly moods.

*Need*: Page J 438 What does a young man need with an overcoat? (cp 'What will he do with . . .').

**13.75.** Where we now say *do away with*, *put up with*, the old phrase was, *do away* a thing, *put up* a thing (the idea was: hide away, pocket):

Bunyan G 51 to *do away* mine [= my sin] | Austen M 359 a source of domestic altercation was entirely *done away* | Austen S 265 the too positive assurances, which she rather wished to *do away* (Cp *do wey* Ch A 3287, G 487) || Marl E 1664 though a many friends Are *made away* | Sh Sonn 11.8 threescore yeare would *make* the world *away* || Sh Oth IV 2.181 Nor am I yet perswaded to *put vp* in peace, what already I haue foolishly suffred | Gay BP 183 To be

call'd a sharper is a reproach that no man of honour can *put up* | Field 3.448 the affront was by no means to be *put up* by any who bore the name of a gentleman . . . nothing should persuade him to *put up* such an affront | Field T 4.139 | Austen S 155 *put up with* every unpleasantness | Quincey 197, 262 *put up with.*

**13.76.** Where an Englishman says "I shall *catch* you *up*", or "I'll *catch up with* you", Americans know only the latter phrase; NED does not mention this *with* (cf Mencken AL 135).

**13.77.** *To have* (*be*) *done* now generally takes *with* in the sense *to have finished*, though the construction without the preposition is still found:

[Bacon A 28. 29 Dinner being done, the Tirsan retireth] | Swift J 30 they had just done dinner | Browning 2.204a Has a man done wondering at women? | Zangwill G 231 when the piano was done growling | Norris O 166 now we are just done putting the curd to press || Spect 76 when they had done with it | Sher 298 they never know when to have done with it | Austen S 191 she had better have her cry out at once and have done with it | Caine P 94 she threw it aside as a thing she had done with | Shaw D 70 Ive quite done with you || Tenn. L 1.164 To be done with this idle banter, I hope that . . . | Caine E 233 He is done with her (also Caine P 181) | Stevenson M P 55 now that he is done with suffering (also Stevenson JHF 49, Henley B 13, 54) | Shaw M 155 I'm done with remittances; and I'm done with you (also ib 94, I 59, B 104) | ib 106 (same person) Ive done with you | Norris O 90 now he was done with it | Kipl J 2.168 here is one that is done with feeding | Barrie T 7 he was anxious to be done with farm labour | Ru P 1.271 if only I can get first done with this autobiography.

"Have you *finished* the paper?" may mean 'written (or read) completely'; while "Have you *finished with* the paper?" means often merely: 'Do you care for it any longer, do you want it any more?' Tracy P 274 If you marry Mary, . . . I'm finished with.

Cf *be through* (*with*) a thing, which is a kind of perfect of the phrase *go through* (*with*) as in Defoe R 2.56 to *go thro' with* his work | Brontë J 302 I begged leave to defer it: no—it should *be gone through with* now . . . you will compel me to *go through* a private marriage ceremony | Di N 553, Shaw D 230 *go through with* it | Di F 726, Wells Ma 2.214. A similar idea is found in the colloquialism Brontë W 102 *Give over with* that baby-work!

### Double Construction.

**13.81.** In consequence of doing away with the old case distinctions we frequently find one word as the object at the same time of a verb and of a preposition; this shows that to the natural speech-instinct the two phenomena are identical and that we are justified in using the term 'object' in both cases. This is rare in ME (AR 128 þe ueond *hateð* and *hunteð after* hire), but becomes increasingly frequent in MnE:

More U 39 pycke out matter to *reprehende* and *find fawt at* | ib 182 they *marueill at* and *detest* the madenes | Sh Hml IV.7.84 I'ue *seene* my selfe, and *seru'd against* the French | Bunyan G 15 they began to *praise*, to *comment*, and *speak well of* me | ib 34 | Congreve 274 This I *have heard of* before, but never *believed* | Field T 3.121 he rather *rejoiced in*, than *regretted* his bruise | Goldsm 616 there he *saw* and *fell in love with* this young lady | id V 1.67 I *loved*, *laughed at*, and *pitied* him | Austen P 185 without either *seeing* or *hearing from* Caroline | Carlyle R 1.228 she did *love* and *aspire to* human excellence | Di N 536 in his own heart he *exulted over* and *cherished* every bad design | Mered H 373 she *detested* and *shrank from* fire-arms | Kipl L 142 he *dreaded* and *longed for* the day | Pater P 33 he *despises* and *is no true lover of* his own art | Lecky D 1.XV the policy of *interfering with*, *regulating* and *protecting* labour | Stevenson MB 78 those who *share* and these who *differ from* his sentiments | Lowell St 302 I rather *wonder at* than *envy* those who can be amused by Dryden's "Spanish Friar" | Bennett LR 169 he *shook hands*

*with* and *thanked* various persons | Locke GP 39 He *detested*, though *felt no alarm at*, the prospect of cross-examination.

Corresponding combinations in relative clauses, see 10.2₆, cf also below 13.9₆.

The place of the adv. *even* is interesting in Hales, Longer E. Poems 256 Milton's commentators, not having observed, or unaware of even, Hesiod's mention of it.

**13.8₂.** In this way a word is often at the same time the object of an active verb and the converted subject of the same verb in the passive: Sterne 46 where he could best *see*, and *be seen by*, his audience | Coleridge B 36 Southey *possesses*, and *is* not *possessed by*, his genius | Browning 2.478 I *love*, *am loved by* some few honest to the core | Lang T 168 Tennyson *entertained*, and *was entertained by*, Mr Huxley | Merriman S 79 De Chauxville *knew* and *was known of* many | Poe S 224 with no other thought Than to *love* and *be loved by* me | James RH 195 Mrs Light approached, *leading* rather than *led by* a tall young man.

A particularly complicated and unnatural combination is Browning 1.523 [her face] Which everybody looks on and calls his, And, I suppose, is looked on by in turn.

## Adverb or Preposition?

**13.9₁₁.** In some combinations of a verb + a particle + an object it may be doubtful whether the particle is an adverb or a preposition. If we say "I couldn't get in a word", *in* is shown to be an adverb, not a preposition, both by the sound (stress on *in*, long [n]) and by the meaning. Thus also, in "we have taken over these words from the French" or "don't knock over those chairs", *over* is undoubtedly an adverb. But sometimes these criteria fail us. Word-order often serves to determine which of the two possibilities is the right one. When the particle comes after the object, this must be governed by the verb, and the particle accordingly is an adverb; but when the particle precedes the object, both alternatives are possible.

In Sh H4A I.2.106 I must *giue ouer* this life, and I will *giue it ouer*, — both the meaning and the position of *over*

after *it* show that we have the adverb *over:* the alternation is the same as is regularly found in "cut off his head", but "cut it off": no one can doubt that *off* is an adverb. The meaning is undoubtedly adverbial in: More U 84 to turne over the leafe | I'll turn over a new leaf. But where meaning is not decisive, as in the following combinations, word-order becomes our only citerion, as it shows whether the cohesion is stronger with the verb or with the primary.

**13.9₁₂.** The position of *over* after the object shows that it is an adverb in: Doyle S 1.28 I should like to *chat* this little matter *over* with you | Wells V 173 as she *looked* them *over* again | Poe S 18 we have *talked* the matter *over* | Wells V 157 *thinking* it *over*. Note the alternation in Brontë V 362 Yes; I have *thought over* your life just as you have yourself *thought it over*.

There is a different use of *think... over*, with *over* as the predicative of a nexus-object: he thought this love affair over, i. e. he thought that it was finished.

**13.9₁₃.** *Over* is also an adverb if other words intervene between it and the object; in some of my examples the word order does not seem quite natural: Spect 145 he *ran over*, with a laughing eye, Crastin's thin legs | Galsw F 343 he ran over to himself his opening words | Keats 5.97 if you can *go over*, day by day, any month of the last year | Ward M 176 to go over in his mind the sentences of a letter | Zangwill G 87 I went over in my mind the girls I could ask | Scott Iv 15 when we first *talked over* together that class of productions | Mackenzie C 108 talking over with her all the partners | *Thinking over* again the reply I made | Gibbon M 85 I soon *turned over*, without much choice, almost all the French books in my tutor's library | Hewlett F 28 Galors turned over in his mind all possible plots | NP '11 Hume *worked over*, one after another, the three books of his "Treatise". — Note *on* in Byron L 227 I have been *thinking over* the other day *on* the various comparisons.

The use of *over and over* also favours the same interpretation: Zangwill G 217 I went over and over again my

ancient exploits | Galsw D 12 She was going over and over again the scene just passed through.

**13.9$_{14}$.** In such simple combinations as Swift J 360 then we went aside, and talked over affairs — one may hesitate, though it would seem most natural nowadays to give *over* stress enough to show that it is an adverb. But in the following quotations the position of subjuncts and of *it* shows that the authors took *over* as a preposition: Kingsley Y 48 he tried to think earnestly over the matter | Ridge B 149 to talk with Ella over old times | Doyle S 1.87 As I drove home I thought over it all | id R 94 I thought well over it.

**13.9$_{15}$.** With *get over* a distinction may be made between *get it over* = 'have done with it, make an end of it', and *get over it* = 'recover from the consequences of it', though it is not always observed: Shaw D 66 Have you any more civilities to address to me? I should like to *get* them *over* before my wife comes back | Hankin 2.105 will you say it as quickly as possible? Then we shall *get* it *over*. | Wells PF 97 I thought we could *get over that*. 'Let's *get it over*' I thought. Now, at any rate — we have *got over that* | Trollope W 216 having *got over* as best he might the disgust created...

**13.9$_{2}$.** *Through* offers sometimes the same difficulty. It is a preposition in *We saw through the secret* (discovered what was behind it), but an adverb in *I'll see him through* (help him to get through). NED has many quotations for the preposition in *go through* (the business, through all the propositions, etc. *go* 63), but I have two quotations for the adverb: Brontë V 17 She went through, in that brief interval of her infant life, emotions such as some never feel | Ward R 2.232 he was going through, once more, that old fierce temptation. *Through* is adverb in Di D 355 a delirious idea of seizing the poker and *running him through* with it. — Cp. *go through with* 13.7$_{7}$.

**13.9$_{3}$.** *By* in *pass by* is a preposition, if the meaning is local, as in "the river passes by a small village", but an adverb in the figurative signification 'pass without taking

notice, overlook, disregard'. These meanings, however, cannot always be kept apart.

The NED says *(pass* 61c): "When the obj. is a sb., it usually comes after *by*, so that the construction can be analysed as that of an intrans. vb., with a preposition and its object, as in *to pass by his eldest son.*" — But this word-order is not sufficient to decide the question; and in this case the stress (or half-stress) laid on *by* shows that it is an adverb.

Examples with *by* after a pronoun: Collins W 408 all three [kinds of death] had passed me by | Thack V 10 every one passed me by here | Hardy R 291 she passed him by | Locke FS 94 the blasting hand had passed her by | James RH 98 The breath of vulgar report passed her by with folded wings. — Note the place at the end in Galsw F 345 without another look Malloring passed the three by — and the word-order in the following quotation, where it would have been difficult to arrange the words differently: Macaulay H 1.3 and not to pass by with neglect even the revolutions which have taken place in dress.

**13.9₄.** I give a few more examples in which the word-order shows that the particle has been felt as more closely connected with the preceding verb than with the following object, which therefore is the object rather of the whole combination than of the preposition: Richardson G 76 Mr. Reeves having *sent for* from his study Bishop Burnet's History | Williamson P 78 I will *dispose of* at Piedimulera all the things with which... | Locke SJ 227 I *came across*, at the very bottom, the manuscript of the preceding narrative.

**13.9₅.** This close connexion of a verb and a particle is also shown in the possibility of the passive construction described below 15.6, and in the end-position of the particle (prep.) in interrogative sentences and relative clauses (10.2₂). In other sentences, too, it is not infrequent for a speaker or writer to place a particle (prep.) at the end which 'governs' a word placed first for emphasis: pretty often he does not know when he begins his sentence whether to use a single verb or a composite verbal phrase. I print here only a few of my examples:

Ch E 1611 His freendes *sente* he *to* | More U 222 The sycke (as I sayde) they *see to* wyth greate affectyon | Sh Tp IV.1.165 Thy thoughts I *cleaue to* | Mcb V.7.14 But swords I *smile at*, weapons laugh to scorne | Fielding T 2.206 and this suspicion, indeed, he well *accounted for* | Quincey 308 The epigram itself I cannot *lay my hand upon* at this moment | Tennyson 395 here he left a child; this will he *send or come for* | Thack S 102 Ancient and Modern History no young woman can *be without* | Mered E 16 one [lady] he *bowed to;* the other bowed to him | Hope Ch 62 Ability we don't expect in a Government office, but honesty one might *hope for.*

**13.9₆.** In this way we find the same preposed word as the object at the same time of a single verb and a verbal phrase (as in 13.8₁): Field T 1.60 these laws my readers are bound to *believe in* and to *obey* | Thack V 9 many a dun had she *talked to*, and *turned way* from her father's door | Di D 139 This precious volume I immediately *discovered* and immediately *applied myself to* | Kingsley H 226 You she will *see and speak with* | Hope Q 3 Alexander she neither loved nor respected; him she only *admired and believed in* | Spencer A 2.111 Some of the minor ones [criticisms] I *accepted and profited by*, but against the major ones I protested.

**13.9₇.** Finally, the cohesion of such verbal phrases is sometimes shown by the occurrence of the preposition *of* after ings formed from them: Lamb E 1.14 the abolition, and *doing-away-with altogether*, *of* those consolatory interstices | NP 94 any radical change will probably entail the *doing away with altogether of* the bus (note the insertion of *altogether* to avoid the clash of *with* and *of*). Cp Defoe M 261 a risk... not worth *his running the hazard of.*

# Chapter XIV.

# Two Objects.

## Direct and Indirect Object.

**14.11.** Some verbs frequently or even regularly have two objects; we shall first mention the type: *he gave the boy a shilling*. Here it is customary to speak of *the boy* as the indirect, and *a shilling* as the direct object. In OE, as in the other old languages of the same family and still in German and Icelandic, etc., we have separate case-forms, the dative for the indirect, and the accusative for the direct object, though it should be remembered that the functions of these two cases are not exhausted by these descriptions. In English the formal distinction has been lost, in substantives chiefly through the loss of the weak *-e* which in many substantives formed the distinctive mark of the dative singular, and through the analogical extension of the nominative-accusative plural, which came to be used where formerly the special dative ending in *-um* was used. In pronouns it is sometimes the old dative *(me, you, us, him, her, hem (them), whom)*, sometimes the old accusative *(it, this, that, what)* that has assumed the functions of both old cases. The former happened with those pronouns which denote persons (and was thence transferred to *them* also when denoting things), the latter with those denoting things (neuter: *this* and *that* are old neuter forms). There is not the slightest ground for speaking of a dative as separate from the accusative in MnE: it is just as unhistorical as it would be to speak of Normandy and New England as parts of the British Empire. We cannot even say that in the sentence quoted above *the boy* is a positional dative, kept distinct from the accusative by being placed before it, for on the one hand, we have the inverse word-order in *give it him* (14.7$_4$), and on the other hand, we have the same word-order in *he called the boy John* and *they made him their chief*, where no one would call *the boy* and *him* datives. Nor can the

possibility of being made the subject of a passive sentence be made the criterion of an accusative as against a dative, see ch. XV. There is no occasion to repeat here the detailed criticism of the latest dative theories which I gave in PG 174 ff.

**14.12.** Still, there is a real distinction between the direct and indirect object in present day English. One important sign of the distinction is the possibility of substituting a *to*-phrase for an indirect object; but though this test is applicable in many cases, it is not in all (see 14.86); and on the other hand, *to* is used very often where we could not think of using the term "indirect object". This possibility of using *to* and of thus discarding the indirect object from the verb is really an outcome of something that cuts deeper, namely that the direct object is more essential to the verb and more closely connected with it than the indirect object, in spite of the latter's seemingly privileged position close to the verb. In "they offered the man a reward" it is possible to isolate the direct object *(they offered a reward)*, but not the indirect object *(they offered the man)*. *A reward* is the object of *offered*, but *the man* is the object of *offered a reward*. It is, therefore, quite natural to ask "What did they offer?" but not "Whom (or To whom) did they offer?" without mentioning the object. Thus also in the passive: we can say "A reward was offered", but not "The man was offered" without saying what; nor can we ask "Who was offered?" though it is possible to ask "Who was offered a reward?" as well as "What was offered?" Hence we may say that in "a reward was offered the man" *a reward* is the subject of *was offered*, but in the equally possible turn "the man was offered a reward" *the man* is subject, not of *was offered*, but of the whole combination *was offered a reward*. The terms direct and indirect object are thus fully justified, the more so as we shall see that sometimes we have two objects with the same verb, to which the considerations here alleged cannot be applied and which must therefore be termed two direct objects (14.9).

**14.13.** The combination of one verb with two objects

(an indirect and a direct one) is to be strictly discriminated from the essentially different phenomenon seen in "they elected Dr. Brown president": here we have not two objects, but one object, the nexus consisting of the two elements *Dr. Brown* (subject-element) and *president* (predicate-element), exactly as in "they made Dr. Brown resign" the verb *made* has the infinitival nexus *Dr. Brown resign* as its one object. The two constructions are brought together in NP '08 "It is honestly true to say of Mr.Wells's books that they *do a man good* [indirect and dir. obj.]. Nay, they almost *make a man good*, for half an hour or so" [*a man good* is a nexus; note that *good* as the predicative is a secondary word, while in the former combination it was a primary]. Cp the pun: The woman who makes a man a good wife also makes him a good husband.

**14.14.** While this volume is passing through the press, I receive Mr. Morgan Callaway's eloquent plea for the continued use of the term dative in English grammar (Publ. of Mod. L. Ass. of America 42, p. 238ff.) I cannot say that it has converted me, and the writer seems to have felt the weakness of his own contention, when he writes that "the fact that with verbs of Giving the indirect (dative) object usually precedes the direct (accusative) object... extenuates, if it does not excuse, one's speaking of *son* as a positional dative, or, preferably, a functional dative whose use is suggested by the position of the noun". Should we really say that in "I'll tell you it" *you* is a positional dative preposed and in "I'll tell it you" the same word is a positional dative postposed? Note also the weakness of the following argument based on relative numbers: "But the fact that *many* accusatives and that only *a few* datives ...can be made into subjects of passive sentences is helpful in differentiating the dative from the accusative".

The analogy from Latin *templum*, etc., cannot be invoked in the way it is done in this article. We recognize *templum* in one sentence as a nominative and in another as an accusative, because the same language in innumerable words distinguishes the forms of the two cases; but we cannot say that *son* in one sentence is an accusative, and in another a dative, for there is not a single word in the whole of the English language which has separate forms for the two cases.

Mr. Morgan Callaway thinks that in my final words on cases (PG 185) I have reintroduced our old friends (nom., gen., dat., acc. etc.) under a slight disguise. He overlooks the fact that I am there speaking of "notional" as distinct from "grammatical" or "syntactic" categories — a distinction which pervades the whole of my grammatical philo-

sophy (see PG 50—57). But in view of this oversight I now wish I had expressed myself somewhat in the following way: "The chief notions for which cases stand in the languages where they are distinguished, are: address (vocative), subject (nominative), etc." Also it would have been better, had I placed this remark on case-notions at the head of the chapter in the same way as in the chapter on Time and Tense I speak of the notion of time before discussing what tenses the various languages distinguish. If we are to recognize a dative in English, we may just as well recognize a vocative, a predicative, a locative, a temporal case, etc., and in another division a post-preterit and a post-future tense.

**14.21.** Examples of the chief verbs admitting the construction with an indirect object; cf for the passive ch. XV.

*Give* and synonyms: Sh Shr Ind. 1.103 giue them friendly welcome everie one | Trollope D 1.255 Give papa my best love | he *left* his sister a hundred pounds | Di N 556 to *restore* a parent his child [also Locke St 157; generally with *to*] | Masefield W 10 There you can ... *stand* her cockshies | Kipl K 178 they would *feed* him raw beef on a plate | Herrick M 82 the police fed them lies (cf 12.55) | Thack V 119 the mere chance.. can *procure* a lady such homage | *get* me some stamps | he *offered* her marriage | *pay* the cabman his fare (cf 12.55) | Sh Meas III.2.263 you haue paid the heauens your function | Thack P 1.173 he thought he would pay the General a visit | Galsw WM 208 he wanted me to *find* the chap a job | Sh As I.1.75 *allow* me such exercises as may become a gentleman || Sh R 3 IV.2.114 What you *promised* me | Defoe M 5 who must *buy* the little gentlewoman clothes? | Wells PF 35 to buy Mary clothes | *furnish*, above 12.55.

**14.22.** *Not to give*, &c: Sh As I.2.198 to *denie* so faire and excellent ladies anye thing | I can *refuse* you nothing (Miss Burney, NED.) | Sh Cæs IV.3.206 For they haue *grug'd* vs contribution | I *forbid* you the use of that word | H 4 B II 4.110 I will *barre* no honest man my house | Di D 94 you have *lost* him his situation | Locke HB 111 The robbers *bled* me eight guineas.

**14.23.** Verbs of motion implying giving: *pass* me the mustard | Defoe Rox 187 Amy *carried* him the hundred

pounds | Sterne 213 *returning* Mons. Dessein his bow | Di Do 237 *throwing* her a shilling | ib 220 he *poured* himself out a dram | Doyle S 1.239 he would *bring* his little boy home a box of bricks | Thack P 1.45 The landlady *dropped* the heir of Fairoaks a very respectful curtsey | James RH 194 she *swept* the young man a curtsey as profound as his own salutation | Williamson Wedd. D. 254 but for one look she had *flashed* him before she went | Walpole G 26 he *flung* his niece a watery wink | Proverb: it is an ill wind that *blows* nobody any good | *set* the boy another task || Locke GP 78 she *smiled* him her thanks (cf 12.2₄).

**14.2₄.** *Bear* (with expressions of feelings): Sh Shr I.1.111 for the *loue* I *beare* my sweet Bianca | Swift 3.344 the *hatred* I *bore* those brutes | ib 3.354 the violent hatred the Houyhnhnms bore them | Thack N 273 the *affection* he *bore* Ethel himself was so great | Austen P 80 he *bore* his young cousin no *ill-will* (GE Mm 234) | Di Ch 71 he *bore* him *company* nevertheless | Hope R 62 we *bore* Heaven *a grudge* that he was not our King.

*Win:* Benson D 2.57 a fast drive into the corner of the court, which *won* him the set.

**14.3₁.** *Wish:* Scott A 2.325 he wished Miss W. joy | Austen P 29 I wish Jane success with all my heart | Doyle S 6.117 why anyone should wish him harm || Pinero S 25 to wish her girl good-bye | Darwin L 1.64 to wish my father and sisters a long farewell. — It is doubtful whether we can speak of two objects in the frequent phrase *wish some one well* (e. g. Marl F 1292, Di N 129, Ru C 109); cf the adverbs (which may be used as an argument against taking *well* as a primary) in Carlyle R 1.225 he wished all the world *rather well* | GE Mm 203 I shall remember *how well* you wished me. For other constructions after *wish* see 13.2₁.

With *wish him well* may be compared *play him false* (Wells Ma 2.34 impulse had so far played them false): *false* is hardly an object | Sh Shr I.2.180 if you *speake me faire* | Shaw P 186 he spoke him fair | Wells Fm 4 he *ran me hard* (also *ran someone close*).

*Intend*, etc.: Swift 3.376 I *meant* them no harm | Goldsm

618 I want a due sense of the honour and happiness *intended* me | Sh H4A V.1.127 thou *ow'st* heauen a death | Beaconsf L 246 you owe the country a good deal, cf 14.8₈; (the old pret. in North 256 the good will they *ought* him).

*Spare, save:* Brontë V 172 he desired me to *spare* you my fine company | McKenna SS 161 if you want to *save* them a long stretch of penal servitude.

**14.3₂.** *Cause*, etc.: this *caused* us much trouble | Thack N 452 the career which had *occasioned* the fond lady such anguish.

*Do*, only in certain set phrases: Fielding 3.540 this rule, of doing no other person *an injury* from any motive | Austen M 251 a warmth of heart which did him *credit* | Brontë V 357 it does a man *good* to see the energy of that boy | Smedley F. 292 I had done her foul *wrong* by my doubts | McKenna SS 214 Will you do me another *favour?* Cp. in the passive: Goldsm V 2.175 I am now come to see *justice* done a worthy man.

*Make:* the joiner made her a stool | By D J 7.17 to make their kettle drum a new skin | Galsw Ca 185 they were the best [boots] he had ever made me | Swift 3.193 I made the Captain a very low bow | Di D 443 I made my gentleman a distant bow.

*Work*, only in a few set phrases, e. g. Doyle NP '95 he had tried to work me so great a mischief.

**14.3₃.** *Tell* and other verbs of communication: he *told* his wife the secret | Carlyle S 14 The lover *whispers* his mistress that the coach is ready | Thack P 1.84 I've a whole desk full of verses he *wrote* me when he was in Trinity College | Trollope O 20 the world does not *write down* a man his good luck as being generally conducive to his happiness | he *wired* (*telegraphed*, (*tele*)*phoned*) them the sad news | Fielding 1.204 Mr. Alworthy failed not to *read* Tom a very severe lecture | Stedman Oxf 121 to read us terrible lessons | Holmes A 327 another poem he wanted to read me | ib. 203 I... *play* you one of my adagio movements... play us so always |

By 640 to *inform* me this [more usual: of this] | he *taught* his children French (cf 14.96).

*Show:* Sh Hml III.2.25 to shew vertue her owne feature | show me that letter.

**14.34.** In *this cost him a lot of money* the natural analysis is to speak of an indirect and a direct object (12.15); NED calls *him* an indirect and a lot of money an adverbial object (whatever that may mean), but says that the verb is really intransitive, because it has no passive — a curious use of the term intransitive. There are similar constructions with *bet* and *fine*, where one is tempted to call the person a direct object and the rest a subjunct of measure: Vachell H 281 I have bet Scaife twenty-five pounds | the magistrate fined him five shillings.

**14.41.** *I buy me clothes* = 'buy to (for) myself': this use of a pronoun of the same person as the subject (a reflexive pronoun without *self)* as an indirect object is not now so usual as in former times, and even the corresponding use of the pronouns with *self* is not very frequent, though by no means rare: the pronoun is generally felt as superfluous.

Examples: Sh Macb IV.2.40 how will you do for a husband? Why I can buy me twenty at any market | Defoe R 69 I made me a large tent (frequent in Defoe: 79,96) | id M 290 till we could have... materials provided for building us a house | ib 2.7 I bought me ploughs | Holmes A 95 one day I bought me a Canary-bird | Stevenson JHF 229 I shall never get me a wife if I live to the age of eagles || Wells T 13 I'd buy myself that | Galsw WM 262 he ordered himself a dozen oysters | Maugham TL 51 It's not often you play yourself a tune | McKenna SS 179 the Seraph lit himself a cigarette. — Note the difference between "she poured herself (ind. obj.) out a glass of wine" and "she poured out a glass of wine herself" (appos. to subj.). — This, with AV Mark 16.3 "Who shall roll vs away the stone from the doore of the sepulchre?" forms a transition to the following phenomenon.

**14.42.** A special class is what is called the "dative of

interest" (dativus ethicus), better perhaps "the affective (or emotional) indirect object" which is used to enliven the style by introducing a personal element, where it is not really necessary for the thought. Examples:

Sh Cæs I.2.270 he pluckt *me* ope his doublet | Sh Meas II.1.121 Come *me* to what was done to her [other instances Franz § 294] | Sheridan 298 Nothing introduces *you* a heroine like soft music | Thack V 30 He could knock *you* off forty Latin verses in an hour.

**14.51.** In most cases the indirect object is a person, thus also in these two quotations, in which *it* refers to the ghost and to a baby, respectively: Sh Hml. 1.1.143 we do it wrong, being so maiesticall To offer it the shew of violence | Fielding T 1.10 in the morning he would give orders of providing it a nurse. Cf also Butler Er 126 because he had done it harm hitherto — where *it* = society.

**14.52.** There are, however, instances in which the indirect object is not a person, thus especially in such set phrases as those in the first four (five) sentences: Sh Cor II.2.36 a mallice, *giuing* itselfe *the lie* | Lamb E 1.54 this intolerable disinclination to dying to *give* it *its mildest name* | Di D 115 if I had *given* it *a thought*, but I gave it none until afterwards [also e. g. give this a thought] | Di Do 88 he had *given* the subject anxious *consideration* | Ridge S 43 you had only to give *imagination* rein | Sh Hml IV.7.194 his rage... this will *giue* it *start* againe | Austen P 342 he expressed his sorrow for her distress, *wished* it *a happier conclusion* | Caine P 253 The opera lacked the life-blood of the stern old Northland. The Englishman could not give it that | Norris O 366 he *allowed* his imagination full play.

**14.53.** Only in very rare cases does the want of a special dative inflexion cause ambiguity. Sh Shr I.1.12 "Pisa Gaue me my being, and my father first" probably means '... and gave my father being before me'. Marlowe F 332 So he will spare *him* 24 *years: him* indirect object, *years* direct; or *him* direct object, *years* subjunct of time? In Sh Oth I.3.163 "she wish'd that Heauen had made her such

a man", we may either take *her* as the indirect object, or *her such a man* as a nexus-object. In Shr I.2.8, "knocke me heere soundly" *me* (emotional indirect object) is intentionally misunderstood as a direct object.

**14.61.** The direct object may be an infinitive: Di D 29 I gave Mr Peggotty to understand that she was as jolly as I could wish.

**14.62.** In "he told (wrote, wired, telegraphed, (tele)-phoned) his sister the sad news" — *his sister* is evidently an indirect object, thus also in the following quotations, in which a whole sentence or clause is the direct object:

Mered R 412 "Richard is very gay", Miss Doria whispered her brother | Barrie MO 77 popping into telegraph offices to wire my father that we should not be home till late | Kipl P 166 I wrote my mother I was happy | Bennett ECh 265 I'll telephone him you're on the way.

**14.63.** With the same verbs we have a frequent use in which the direct object is not expressed: *He told his sister, who told their father.* Here the speaker does not say what he or she told, because it is evident from the whole situation or context (told the story, told that which you know), in the same way as we say "Yes, I know" (= I know what you are alluding to, or, what you mentioned, etc.). But the case is somewhat different in the following sentences in which we cannot in the same way supply a direct object, and in which it is therefore preferable to call the object a direct one, reserving the name 'indirect object' for combinations which contain another object: Di D 539 he has always been at my elbow, *whispering* me | Carlyle R 1.12 I once *wrote him* about my being in Smithfield Market | Herrick M 112 she had *written some cousins* in Kentucky (extremely frequent in US) | Barr NP '03 she had *telegraphed the editor* | James S 105 there's nothing for me but to *wire her* the first thing in the morning | Norris O 55 After *telephoning Cutter*, Harram put on his hat | Kaye Smith HA131 Have you *'phoned* Dr. Mount? || Wells T 54 they were *signalling me* to come up.

In these sentences, no mistake can be possible, as the person cannot possibly be the direct object of such verbs as *whisper*, *write*. But even here many writers prefer adding *to* to make the sentence absolutely clear; and this of course is necessary with such verbs as can take a person as the direct object: *he sent me* would be naturally understood in this way; hence it is necessary to say *he sent to me* = 'he sent someone to me'.

## Place of the Indirect Object.

**14.7₁.** As a rule the indirect object is placed (after the verb) immediately before the direct object, only in rare cases separated from this by a complementary adverb as in Carlyle R 1.155 he sometimes *gave me up* his bedroom.

In most combinations of two objects one denotes a person and the other a thing, and then in nearly every case the person is the indirect, and the thing the direct object. The greater interest felt for persons leads to their names being generally mentioned first, and thus we get the main rule that the indirect object comes first, which then is transferred to those rare cases in which it denotes a thing (14.5₂). With pronouns, however, matters are somewhat more complicated.

**14.7₂.** First we shall give some examples with pronouns in which the indirect object has its usual first place:

AR 262 he scheauwed him ou | Malory 135 I sende her hym to a presente | Sh Cor I.4.6 No, Ile nor sel nor giue him [the horse]: lend you him I will | Brontë V 354 Monsieur, tell me them [impressions] | Stevenson B 18 Bring me him down like a ripe apple | Benson D 61 as nature has denied me them [ideas] | ib 204 give me her back for one moment | Shaw C 267 I grudged him you | Curle L 83 the door cautiously opened and showed me him.

Thus also with *it* as the direct object: B Jo 3.23 give me it again | AV Tobit 4.14 giue him it out of hand | Di N 189 Then in Heaven's name, my good friend, tell me it | Tenn 384 [I] offer'd you it kneeling | id 207 give her the child! or if you scorn ... give *me* it: I will give it her | Mered H 99

he told us it himself | Doyle S 2.41 I'll tell you it just as it happened | Barrie M 198 it was me that gae him it.

**14.73.** But there is in all languages a tendency to place a weakly stressed pronoun as near to the verb as possible. This causes no conflict with the general rule in sentences like *give him the money* | *bring me some* | *show me that letter.* But it may sometimes lead to the direct object being placed before the indirect object.

First we shall give some examples of pronoun (dir.) before substantive (indir.). This is rare with *them ('em):* Thack V 324 Pretty pearls — never gave 'em the ironmonger's daughter — but more frequent with *it*, especially in ElE: Ml J 802 And I will giu't your honour | Sh Merch V.1.157 Gaue it a Judges clearke | Sh Tp II.1.91 giue it his sonne for an apple (Sh Alls V.3.83, V.3.280, Lr V. 3.251, etc.) | B Jo 1.26 give it the gentleman | Swift P 157 give it the Colonel | Spect 238 I shall give it my Reader as well as I can remember | Galsw WM 305 I'd give it those two heavy pug-faced chaps.

Note the two word-orders in the following quotation: in both the weak pronoun is placed before the heavier subst.: Defoe M 7 they often gave me money, and I gave it my old nurse.

**14.74.** Next we give examples of the extremely frequent word-order: *it* (dir.) before another pronoun (indir.): AR 292 scheau hit him | Ch A 4343 I graunte it thee | Caxton R 34 yf the kynge wolde graunte it hym | Sh H4A I.3.224 Ile haue a starling... and giue it him | B Jo 3.114 I may show it these | Walton A 59 to tel it you | Fielding T 1.277 why don't you present it him of your own accord? | Beaconsf L 481 You must get her to show it you | GE Mm 220 let me tell the story, as mother told it us.

Why is *it*, more often than other pronouns, put in this place? Fehr (Anglia Beibl. 1911.37) accounts for it by rhythmical reasons: it is placed in the 'dip' (senkung) after the verb because it is weaker than a substantive (offer it the girl) and even than such pronouns as *me*, *you*, *him* (give it him). This, however, cannot be the complete reason, for

then we should expect combinations like *show him the girl* with *him* as direct and *the girl* as indirect object to be frequent, for the rhythm is exactly the same, but as a matter of fact they are extremely rare. Therefore I think that there are two concurrent reasons: (1) *it* is neuter, and (as remarked above) names of things are nearly always direct objects: therefore no ambiguity is to be feared from the *it*-combinations as there would be from others. And (2) *it* may phonetically represent an earlier *it to*, which became first [ittə, itə] and then with the usual loss of weak [ə] : [it], just as, for instance *at the (atte) laste* became *at last* (I 6.36). *Give it me* therefore represents an earlier *give it to me* as well as an original *give it me;* cf Ch G 1118 and shewed it the preest, where the Ellesm. MS alone has *it to the p.*

**14.7₅.** Ellis (Trans. Philol. Soc. 1888. 92) gives the rule that "when both objects are pronouns, the acc. precedes, *he gave it me*, not *he gave me it*, so in *he gave her him*, *her* is the acc.; if we want to make *her* the dative, we must use a preposition, as *he gave him to her*".—The examples given in 14.7₂ show that this rule is too absolute; but here I shall give some examples in which it is observed. This occasions no ambiguity if one pronoun denotes a thing and the other a person, in other words if *them* is a plural of *it*, as in: Ch D 1481 I tolde hem thee | Marl F 403 I gaue them him... I giue them you againe | Sh Cymb IV.2.85 The man that gaue them thee | Err V.385 my man did bring them me | Cæs III.2.255 he hath left them you | Beaconsf L 279 The great man would have supplied them [rifles] me at once | Zangw G 342 why do you never come and let me show them [books] you? | Benson D 2.13 she said the Emperor had given them [snuffboxes] her | Lawrence L 130 I'd give them you for breakfast again.

**14.7₆.** The following cases are more difficult, because the preposed direct object is a person: AR 406 ich chulle senden hine ou | Marl E 1271 we deliuer him you | Sh Tp III.2.68 Ile yeeld him thee asleepe | Ado IV.1.27 will you... giue me this maid? As freely, sonne, as God did giue her

me | AV John 17.6 thou gauest them [men] me | Kingsl H 39 Give him us! We have not seen blood for many a day.

In such combinations the context (situation, sometimes assisted by gesture) only can show which is direct and which indirect object; careful speakers and writers would generally prefer the unambiguous construction with *to*, as in Sheridan 180 I don't wonder at people giving him to me for a lover | Di X 218 they showed her to him | Kaye Smith GA 40 his work was giving her to him more surely than any caresses. No one can tell what is meant by *'em* (*um*) and what by *them* in Sh H5 IV.3.124 They [the French] shall haue none [no ransom], I sweare, but these my joynts: Which if they haue, as I will leaue vm them, Shall yeeld them little.

We have seen the influence of stress (rhythm) in some places; it is evident also in the following two quotations: Greene J4 373 search me them out and bring them me (the first *me* is the weak emotional (14.42), the second has stronger stress) | Benson D 2.218 you gave me yourself.

If *The Saturday Review* (19.1.1901) is right in saying that an Englishman can and usually does say *He gave it me*, while his American cousin invariably says *to me*, this may perhaps be ascribed to the greater natural freedom and ease often found in British speech, while (educated) Americans are more restrained in their anxiety to avoid errors.

### The *to*-phrase.

**14.81.** While the use of the indirect object, at first with a definite case-ending (dative), later without any such ending and therefore no longer properly to be termed a dative, goes back to the earliest times accessible, the concurrent use of a prepositional phrase has been steadily growing since the first feeble beginnings in OE. It is quite natural that *to*, which indicates a movement in the direction of someone, should be used as a more emphatic or distinct expression of the relation otherwise indicated by the dative; we see the same thing in other languages, e. g. Scandinavian (giv det til mig[1]), Romanic *a(d)*. See NED *to* VIII; Wülfing S

[1] Orrm also uses the Scand. *till* in this way: 2 p. 337 Filippess wif... gifenn till Herode King (but without prep. p. 338 ȝaff Herode King þatt wif).

2.519ff.; Trampe Bødtker Crit. Contr. to Early E. Synt. 39ff.; Keilmann, Dativ und Acc. beim verbum (Gießen diss. 1909); Fehr, Anglia Beibl. Febr. 1911.

Thus in OE we have already Oros. 280 he forlét Italiam & Affricam to Galeriuse 'he gave up I. and A. to G.' (ib. also with *léton)* | Chron. 1123 seide to þam kyng; cf. the regular *cweðan* to | Wulfstan 231 eowre teoðunge ageofað to godes mynstrum, etc. Other early examples are: AR 90 Scheau þi neb to me auh to no oðer, ostende mihi faciem | ib 242 God wolde.. scheawen ham to men iðisse werlde | Ch MP 3.1016 She wrong do nolde to no wight | Ch B 975 to his wyf he yaf hir | ib 1123 To Cristes chirche he did greet honour | G 470 | Mandev 219 to teche it to no creature | Caxton R 55 for to shewe them to you here | Mal 131 yelde the to me... leuer.. than yelde me to the.

This use of *to* as an alternative to the indirect object is related to the use after such verbs as *bow, submit, apologize, consent, agree, happen, occur,* and after adjectival phrases like *it is the same, important, necessary, indifferent,* etc.; cp also *she was a sister to him.*

**14.82.** The local meaning of *to*, which is more or less present to the mind after such verbs as *give*, *hand*, *lend*, *show*, and even *teach*, is totally obliterated after such verbs as *deny*, *refuse*, where the construction has been introduced by analogy: Sh Tim IV.3.537 Giue to dogges what thou denyest to me | Mi PL 9.766 For us alone Was death invented? or to us deni'd This intellectual food | Tennyson 348 When I that knew him fierce and turbulent Refused her to him, then his pride awoke.

In spite of the fact that "I gave the boy an apple" and "I gave an apple to the boy" are practically equivalent, it would be wrong to say, as is often said, that *the boy* and *to the boy* are the same "case" (dative) or that *to the boy* is a dative-equivalent. Two constructions may mean the same, or nearly the same thing, and yet be grammatically different: "I happened to see it" and "I saw it accidentally" are synonymous, but *happened* is a verb, and *accidentally* an adverb. "To replace B by A" and "to substitute A for B"

mean the same thing, but that does not make A the object of the former or B the object of the latter construction, etc. The *to*-phrase is placed in another relation to the verb than the indirect object; it is not only physically (through its articulation) placed at a greater distance from the verb, but also intrinsically more loosely connected with it, and stands in exactly the same way as other subjuncts consisting of a preposition and its object, while the indirect object is closely connected with the verb, though, as we have seen, not so intimately connected with it as either the subject or the direct object. No real understanding of the structure of English is possible if its fundamental distinctions are obscured by misleading terms taken from structurally different languages such as Latin or even Old English.

**14.83.** As the indirect-object relation is generally indicated by the position before the direct object, the *to*-phrase is as a rule preferred, or may even be necessary, where for some reason or other this position is not possible, thus especially when a word is placed first for emphasis: Sh As V.4.122 To you I giue my selfe | Kingsley H 136 "What does that teach thee?" A. was silent. "To me it teaches this..." | To him they showed everything, to me nothing.

This is the reason why *to* is generally used with interrogative and relative pronouns: *To whom did you give it?* (literary) or *Who(m) did you give it to?* (colloquial) is more usual than "Who(m) did you give it?" cf Bennett LM 12 Who did I say that to? — Straker. He's just told me | Collins W 160 the man to whom my father gave me, and to whom I gave myself | Maugham PV 165 It was the same with the older girls, those to whom she taught sewing. See also 7.25.

*To* would now be required in Sh Mids I.1.81 his Lordship, *whose vnwished yoake* My soule consents not to giue soueraignty | Sh Merch III.4.6 if you knew to whom [N. B. *to*] you shew this honour, *How true a gentleman* you send releefe.

Sometimes we have a *to*-phrase repeated afterwards by means of a pronoun without *to:* Ch E 395 I seye that *to this newe markisesse* God

hath swich fauour sent *hir* of his grace | Sh As II.3.10 *to some kind of men* Their graces serue *them* but as enemies.

In a different way we have first an indirect object and then *to* in Trollope B 452 the Englishman's habit of offering *each* an arm *to two ladies* at the same time.

**14.84.** It is evidently easier to have the order indirect plus direct object if the former is short than if it is long. All the examples given above show either a pronoun or a single substantive or at any rate a comparatively short group as the indirect object. But we have *to* in sentences which with the opposite order would be top-heavy: note the difference in Hope In 56 Friends do *one another* good turns; I don't go about doing them *to anybody I meet*. The relative clause evidently makes *to* necessary in Morley Misc. 1.197 you need to give the tools *to him who can handle them*.

Grattan & Gurrey OLL 179 exaggerate when they say that "when the thing indirectly affected by the action is not expressed by a single substantive, but by a Noun-Group, the Particle stands before the Noun-Group — for example, He gave a book *to the little girl*". It is quite normal to say "He gave *the little girl* a book" and "Give *your sister and all the children* our best regards".

The double construction with different word-order is analogous to what we find with other prepositions: he gave the boys some money | he gave some money to the boys, cp I lived three years there | I lived there for three years | he is five years my senior | he is my senior by five years | he paid a good deal too much | this is paying too much by a good deal.

**14.85.** *To* is necessary when the direct object is not expressed: she gave largely to hospitals | Defoe Rox 18 he that gives to the poor lends to the Lord; let us lend our heavenly Father a little of our children's bread. Cp, however, 14.63.

Note the use of *to* in sentences like the following, in which it is necessary because the direct object is omitted in the second part: A. V. Gen 1.29 I haue *giuen you* euery herbe... And *to euery beast* of the earth, and *to euery foule* of the aire | 1 Cor 10.32 Giue *none* offence, neither *to theJewes*, nor *to the Gentiles* | Kipl J 2.41 all that life was ended; and he *bore it* no more ill-will or good-will than a man *bears to a colourless dream of the night* | Earle E. Phil. 555 in common

parlance we *give a writer* the credit of his rhythm, as we *do to Milton.*

Cf also the following, where *to* is used for similar reasons, though *defie* generally takes an ordinary object: Sh As IV.3.33 she *defies me*, Like Turke *to Christian* (Cp 12.7₂).

**14.8₆.** In some combinations the *to*-phrase is hardly ever found. Onions, AS 40, mentions *deny*, *do* (to do one a favour), *forgive*, *pardon*, *play* (play one a trick), *reach* (reach me my hat), *save* (it saves me a deal of trouble), and *spare.* — But occasionally *to* is used after *deny* (14.8₂); NED has some examples of *reach* with *to* and *unto.* *Play* in the non-figurative sense has often *to:* he played Beethoven to us. *To* would be impossible in *keep (bear) me company* | I *never gave it a thought* | *it gave her some uneasiness* | *the hatred I bore her* | *this lost him his seat in Parliament*, and generally in the emotional use mentioned in 14.4₂.

*To* is unusual in Di Do 538 I wish well to him.

**14.8₇.** Some phrases with *give* are now felt as wholes that require *to: give rise to*, *give birth to a son*, *give way to* (obsolete as in Sh John II. 1.324 giue the victors way), *he gave himself up to study*, *give one's heart to the subject.*

Similarly: *pay attention to* (a teacher, a young lady, one's work), *pay heed to; make love to.*

**14.8₈.** *Leave* may have an indirect object (cf 14.2₁); but we always say: *Leave that to me* = 'let me take care of that' | he left him to his own resources | Defoe M 106 But I leave the readers of these things to their own reflections.

*Owe* has often an indirect object (14.3₁), or *to*, both together in Sh Shr V.2.155 Such dutie as the subiect owes the Prince, Euen such a woman oweth to her husband. But in the sense 'to be indebted for, to have, as received from a person' requires *to*, thus (NED): we owe the discovery of the prismatic spectrum to Sir Isaac Newton | Mason R 268 she owed it to him that she had turned to the Alps (cf 2.1₃) | NP' 14 he owed to the spirit of the old town also that power of receiving lasting impressions... A related meaning is seen in McKenna Sh 231 they owed it to Denys to wipe out the

memory of the past; cf the ptc Benson D 2.208 It was owing to him to do him so much justice.

**14.89.** A certain number of verbs, chiefly of Latin origin, which from their meaning might be expected to be able to take an indirect object, are nearly always combined with *to*, e. g. *ascribe*, *allot*, *assign*, *attribute*, *cede*, *dedicate*, *describe*, *discover*, *distribute*, *explain*, *formulate*, *hint*, *impute*, *introduce*, *lease*, *mention*, *picture*, *point out*, *preach*, *propose*, *recommend*, *reveal*, *refer*, *relate*, *speak*, *state*, *suggest;* cf also the list in Sattler's Sachwörterbuch 1015.

### Two direct objects.

**14.91.** The reader is invited to compare combinations like the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| strike him<br>strike a heavy blow | strike him a heavy blow |
| I envy you<br>I envy your beauty | I envy you your beauty |
| hear me<br>hear one word | hear me one word |
| answer me<br>answer this question | answer me this question |
| ask John<br>ask a question | ask John a few questions |
| take the boy (out)<br>take a long walk | take the boy a long walk |
| forgive me<br>forgive my sins | forgive me my sins |

In OE *ascian* had two acc., or dat. + acc., or acc. (person) + gen.; *forgifan* had dat. + acc. But the question that occupies us here is, how the modern constructions should be analyzed.

**14.92.** In all the combinations placed in the left-hand column we speak of (direct) objects (some of them instrumental objects): may we not then in those in the right-hand column speak of two objects and call them both direct objects? It is true that some of them, at any rate, resemble combinations of indirect and direct objects, and that just

as in these the name of the person is placed first; yet if we apply the criteria of indirect objects mentioned in 14.1₂, we see the difference, and it is therefore better here, where the *to*-phrase cannot be used, and where each of the two objects can stand by itself without the other, to speak of two direct objects. It is, of course, also possible to say that the first only is an object and the second a subjunct (of manner or extent); but this analysis is unnatural in some of the combinations, and does not do justice to the parallelism between our left-hand and our right-hand column.

**14.9₃.** We shall now give some literary quotations for these and some analogous constructions: Fielding 3.593 he *struck* my ravisher such a blow | Di D 32 he struck the table a heavy blow with his right hand | Kipl J 1.224 the mule *caught* the camel two kicks in the ribs | Bennett HM 31 don't catch that rude fellow one in the eye | Swift J 404 I *hit* my face such a rap by calling the coach to stop | Masefield W 56 Jimmy longed to hit the man a swipe.

Mi SA 551 I drank... nor *envy'd* them the grape Whose heads that turbulent liquor fills with fumes | Cowper L 1.151 I cannot envy you your situation | Shelley 554 the poor worm who envies us His love.

Sh Cor III.1.215 *Heare* me one word (also Alls V.2.37, R3 IV.4.180 a word), antiquated | Austen M 148 have the goodness to hear me my third act | Thack N 463 Maria was hearing them their Catechism | Di N 87 take those fourteen little boys and hear them some reading | Butler W 68 he hears his children their lessons.

Behn 323 she *suffered* him all the decent freedoms he could wish to take | Hewlett Q 184 suffer me one more word.

Peele D 453 *Answere* me one thing | Trollope B 282 Come, answer me this at your leisure.

Sh Meas III.1.173 Let me *ask* my sister pardon.

Thack V 250 to *take* her out a walk | ib 492 the carriage went for Jos to the Club, and took him an airing | Mulock H 1.166 John took me a new walk across the common | Galsw MP 207 I shall never forget the drive he took me.

AV Matt. 6.12 And *forgiue* vs our debts, as we forgiue our debters. In Sh with personal object Wiv II.2.58, with real object ib III.3.226, and with both Tp III.2.139: O forgiue me my sinnes | ib V.119 I doe entreat Thou *pardon* me my wrongs. (In other places with only one object, either person or offence). A different construction is H4A I.2.103 God forgiue thee for it. *Forgive* and *pardon* also, though rarely, are combined with the *to*-phrase, and therefore we might say that when we have two objects, the first is an indirect one. Cp further Carroll L 60 the governess would never think of *excusing* me lessons for that.

Morgan Callaway, jr., writes in the article quoted in 14.14, that he thinks that the two sentences "I heard the boy his lessons" and "I took the boy long walks" are not idiomatic English in America.

**14.94.** As a clause can be a direct object (2.12), we must say that in sentences like the following we have two direct objects: Defoe M 264 I understood you that it might be possible to buy it off | Di D 396 I understood him that you were at Oxford. This of course is short for *understood you (him) to say*, where the analysis is different: *you to say* is an infinitival nexus-object, and the content-clause then becomes the object of *say*. We may even have three objects: Farnol A 315 they bet each other vast sums that "Clasher" would do it in a canter.

**14.95.** *Lead one a dance* seems parallel to *take one a walk;* but in the corresponding phrase *lead him a dreary life* (Sterne 84 they led him a busy life on't | ib 19 what a dance he may be led | Thack V 344 he led his clerks a dire life | Stevenson T 58 I led that boy a dog's life) it is probably better to take the person as the indirect object.

**14.96.** *Teach* might seem to belong to this class of verbs taking two direct objects, as we may say both *he teaches boys only, not girls*, and *he teaches French;* still in *he teaches the boys French* it is more natural to call *the boys* an indirect object. Note that it is possible to use *to:* Goldsm V 1.174 he has taught that song to our Dick... has taught me two songs | Shaw 2.124 the sort of woman who will teach it to

him | id D *66 all the grossest lies were taught to the doctors by the people. — The same remarks apply to *pay* and *serve*.

*He called her names* might be considered a case in point; the locution probably arose from combinations like *he called her (a) slut*, where we have a nexus-object; cf Defoe M 125 calling her all the whores and hard names he could think of | id Rox 284 by calling the poor girl all the damned jades and fools (and sometimes worse names) that she could think of.

I have some hesitation in placing here Bennett W 1.119 *kissing* her mother good night (also ib. 1.290, Brontë W 187, Hewlett Q 268, Wells T 103, Williamson S 134, Herrick M 123) | Hankin 2.167 I think I must kiss you good-bye (also Wells T 40, Norris P 219, Herrick M 197, 314) | Hardy L 7 he stooped to kiss her a farewell | Mackenzie C 196 (he should) have kissed her a welcome to the sweet twenties | id SA 174 he had *patted* Mac [a dog] good-bye; cp the somewhat different Black Ph 98 ready to *smile* us an adieu — in which it would seem more natural to call *us* an indirect object. Locke HB 272 he kissed her a hearty, unintelligible kiss — the first for twenty years — here we have a 'cognate object' (12.3) besides the object *her*.

**14.97.** With *dismiss* it is better to take the second substantive as a subjunct: Defoe R 2.77 they dismissed them the society. Note that it is possible to say *dismiss them*, but not *dismiss the society;* in the passive, the person only can be made subject, see 15.5. The same remark applies to *banish:* Marl E 379 Are you content to banish him the realme? | ib 1596 doest thou banish me thy presence ? — A similar construction is found in to *let someone blood*, e. g. Defoe R 2.21 our surgeon was oblig'd to let above thirty of them blood. Here we have originally a dative, see Lagamon 1.151 & ofte hine baðie & *him* blod lete; but in the passive it is always *he was let blood*, never with *blood* as the subject (15.5).

**14.98.** *He painted the door a different colour from the wall:* this construction is similar to the ones we have been considering here, and connects them with the predicative

use of substantives (the door is another colour than the wall) to be dealt with in 18.8.

**14.9₉.** Although there are, as we have seen, doubtful cases which can be analyzed in more than one way, I think it necessary to admit the construction with two direct objects as a definite grammatical category, and thus to distinguish the following typical cases:

*they made him President:* one obj. (a nexus consisting of a subject-part and a predicate-part).
*they gave him a blow:* two objects, indirect and direct.
*they hit him a blow:* two direct obj.
*they hit him another way:* direct obj. and subjunct.

---

## Chapter XV.

## Subject of Passive Verb.

**15.1₁.** What in the active is an object, is made the subject in the passive. This occasions no difficulty when there is only one object of the active verb: *he loves her* is made into *she is loved (by him)*. This is the rule from the ME period even when the object originally was in the dative case, thus even before the disappearance of the distinction between dative and accusative in AR 8 ure louerd beo iðoncked (the dative in that text is *louerde)*. Other early examples of the passive construction with verbs which originally governed the dative: Ch LGW 1984 he shall be holpen | Malory 125 he myght neuer be holpen | ib 36 youre herte shalbe pleasyd | ib 463 he was answerd. It is not necessary to give later examples as the old dative and accusative have been completely merged in one oblique case.

The passive participle *pleased* is common in the sense 'glad'; it is really an adjective and can be combined with the adverbs *very, so, more, most* (So pleased to see you!, etc.). The real passive of *please* is rarer: Galsw SP 84 For one who liked to please men, and to be pleased by them, there was a certain attraction about that life.

**15.1₂.** Not every object can be made the subject of a passive sentence. Some verbs do not admit of a passive turn, although according to the analysis here preferred they take an object in the active, thus *cost*, *weigh*, *last* (it costs two shillings | it weighs three pounds | it will last two years); nor is it possible to turn *she sat the horse with perfect ease* into a passive. With other verbs the passive is at any rate unidiomatic: instead of *is owed to* one usually says *is due to* (this discovery is due to Newton = we owe this discovery to N.), or in other combinations *is owing to*. (Cf, however, 15.3₆). It would be unnatural to say "His father was *resembled* by him" instead of "he resembled his father", though I have found one example of the passive: Bradley Sh. Trag. 55 in the result of this peculiarity it [Othello] is resembled only by Ant. & Cleop. I give a few more examples of passive constructions, which are somewhat unusual or might seem unidiomatic: Doyle B 201 an unnecessary risk would be *run* | NP '02 In December $7^1/_2$ hours only per day are *worked* | NP '24 Frightful penalties are to be *threatened* to any individual found guilty | a mile can be *walked* in twenty minutes and run in ten: with regard to this last an English friend writes: "possible, but not common. Might quite easily occur and not attract any special attention".

**15.1₃.** In some cases the nature of the object precludes it from being made the subject of a passive sentence, thus the infinitive in: he wants to sing | he likes to sing, etc., though *to sing* is here an object. (Even more impossible is it to make the inf. *sing* in *he can (may, will*, etc.) *sing* into the subject of a passive, as the auxiliaries have no passive). With regard to reflexive pronouns it is obvious that they cannot as such be made subjects of passives: *he praises himself* cannot be made into *himself is praised by him*, but only into *he is praised by himself*, with shifting of the reflexive element to the converted subject. No passive is possible of those verbs which are always used reflexively: he *betook himself* to his heels | she *prides herself* on her good looks | he *availed himself* of this chance, etc.

**15.1₄.** A cognate object may be made the subject of a passive verb: Galsw D 204 conscious of innumerable lives being lived round him, and loves loved | Bennett C 2.40 His whole life seemed to be lived in the past.

## Direct and Indirect Object.

**15.2₁.** When a verb in the active has two objects, both cannot be made subjects in the passive: there can be only one subject in a sentence, which determines the person and number of the verb. The other object then is "retained" as such; in other words, a passive verb can take an object just as well as an active one — though curiously enough grammarians seem to shirk the admission of this simple fact. In MnE it is, of course, only pronouns, and only some of them, that can show by their form whether we have to do with an object or with a subject, see examples of pronouns in the oblique case as objects of passive verbs in 15.2₂ and 15.4₁.

Let us first consider those verbs which have an indirect besides the direct object. Here two constructions are possible according as one or the other object is made into the subject. The older construction agrees with what is the practice in such cognate languages as German and Latin; the younger is more fully developed in English than in any other Aryan language.

**15.2₂.** The old construction, in which the direct object is made the subject of the passive, and the indirect object is retained, is still seen in the following cases (in the first there is no subject proper); pronouns showing case are italicized: (Ch H 337 thus was *me* told and taught) | Malory 48 whan it was told the kynges that ... | ib 89 there was told *hym* the aduenture of the swerd | ib therefore was gyuen *him* the pryse | Sh R 2 II.3.134 attorneyes are deny'd *me* | Sh Wint III.3.121 it was told *me* I should be rich by the fairies | Bacon A 7.24 Ther was given *us* also, a boxe of ... pills | Mi A 24 that no gesture be taught our youth | Mi Pr 302 some other hour of the day might be taught *them* the rules of arithmetic | Walton A 156 the rest must be taught you

by practice | Bunyan P 3 it shall be told *thee* what thou shalt do | Swift J 195 yesterday was sent *me* a Narrative printed, with all the circumstances of Mr. Harley's stabbing | Austen S 26 the horses which were left *her* by her husband | Brontë V 392 I have now told monsieur all that was told *me* | Carlyle FR 367 an august Assembly ... it does what it can, what is given it to do | Holmes A 228 they will believe anything which is taught *them* | Stevenson B 273 justice shall be done you | Hardy W 66 if it had not been for you this terrible ordeal would have been saved *me* | Walpole G 3 Had time been permitted *him*, he would have ... Time was not allowed *him*.

Some of these sentences would not be natural in the speech of our own days, thus those beginning with *there*. In some the construction with the indirect object turned into the subject would now be preferred, or else the word-order would be changed: *he was told the adventure of the sword*, or, *the adv. of the s. was told him* | *therefore he was given the prize*, or, *therefore the prize was given (to) him* | *some other hour of the day they might be taught the rules of ar.*, etc. The nineteenth century sentences might still be heard or written, though even some of them sound a little stiff nowadays.

The *to*-phrase is naturally often used with passive verbs as well as with active ones; Sh H5 II Prol 11 crownes and coronets, promis'd to Harry and his followers | Franklin 182 No such honor had been paid him when in the province, nor to any of his governors (with this cp the examples in $14.8_5$).

**15.2₃.** The new construction, in which the indirect object is made the subject of the passive verb and the direct object is retained as such, is extremely rare before the MnE period. Some of the ME examples given by Mätzner 2.231 and by Lounsbury SU 176, seem to me very doubtful. In ChE I said that the only example I had found in Chaucer, was LGW 292 And some were brend, and some were cut the hals — but I should not now give this as an example, as *cut* does not ordinarily take an indirect object, and *the hals* is therefore rather to be looked upon as a subjunct.

**15.2₄.** The new construction is due in the first place to the effacement of the formal distinction between the dative and the accusative. A second reason seems to be the same which assisted in changing the construction of many verbs (*dream, like*, etc., see 11.2), namely the greater interest felt for the person. This, as we have seen, is the reason why in the active the indirect is placed before the direct object, as in the sentence: "He offered the girl a gold watch". Thus it became natural to place the dative in the very beginning of the passive sentence: "The girl was offered a gold watch". Now, the position immediately before the verb is in most sentences, active and passive, reserved for the subject; so *the girl*, though originally a dative, came to be looked on as a nominative, and instead of "*her* was offered a watch", the new construction arose "*she* was offered a watch".

A concurrent cause of the rise of the new construction may have been the fact that some of the verbs which can take an indirect object are also found with only one (personal) object: *they showed us upstairs*, passive *we were shown upstairs* — which may have assisted in making people say *we were shown a room.*

Deutschbein SNS 169 sees another cause in the analogy from infinitival constructions: *he was permitted to go* leads to *If I were permitted a glance at the book* (= to glance at the book).

There have thus been several inducements to change the old construction. We shall now illustrate the new construction, first from examples with substantives, which have no case forms to show whether they are subjects or objects. That they are subjects in the following quotations, is evidnet from the word-order, sometimes also from the forms of the verb, in which case these are here italicized. If we say "John was awarded a prize", *a prize* cannot in MnE be the subject, for (with pre-order of *John)* then we should have had the word-order "John a prize was awarded", which is impossible.

**15.2₅.** First, then we give some examples in which the subject has no separate case-form: Sh Merch II.8.7 But

there the Duke was given to vnderstand That in a gondilo were seene together Lorenzo and his amorous Jessica | Cæs III.2.64 his speech ... which Marke Antony By our permission is allow'd to make | Di N 63 to this day the stranger is shown in York cathedral an old window called the Five Sisters | McCarthy 2.64 the English people were promised sufficient supplies | Hewlett Q 168 the simple truth was given a dog's death | Wilde S 192 All that the public are allowed to know is that the divorce has taken place | Shaw P XXIII genius, demanding bread, is given a stone after its possessor's death | Ward E 349 Eleanor had been ordered goats' milk by the doctor | Stevenson M 238 a saint might have been pardoned a little vehemence | Benson D 2.310 Edith had been brought her large beer-mug.

**15.2₆.** Next I give examples with infinitives, participles and verbal substantives, where the new construction appears from the whole context, but is not shown by any case form: Latimer Sp 3, XXI, 49 if you coulde beare to be toulde of youre faultes | Sh Ro I.2.105 Ile go along no such sight to be showne | Thack N 26 Being offered a writership, he scouted the idea of a civil appointment | Stevenson NP There is nothing more disenchanting to man than to be shown the springs and mechanism of any art | Wilde L 63 he is flattered at being sent such a pretty toy | Zangwill G 75 the immense relief he really felt at being spared social obloquy | Walpole F 359 Let me be promised that I will never have any trouble.

**15.3₁.** In the following paragraphs I give examples of the new construction with pronouns in the nominative, arranging the verbs in mainly the same order as in ch. XIV.

*Give.* The oldest examples I have, all contain the combination "given to understand, know", thus Sh As I.1.128 I am giuen, sir, secretly to vnderstand that your younger brother . . . | H4A IV.4.11 | Straw I.4.42 as we are giuen to know | Di N 518 I was given to understand by Fanny herself, that you had made an offer to her | Thack N 330 | Bennett

P 209 He had understood — or more correctly he had been given to understand — that the house...

The reason why this construction is found so much earlier than other examples with *give*, is certainly that *I am given to understand* was felt as parallel to *I am made to understand* and other passives of constructions with infinitive nexus. The rest of my examples with *give* are comparatively recent, much later than many examples with synonyms; I shall print a good many examples, as it is often said that the construction is wrong, or that it is only found in certain combinations: Austen P 453 I was given good principles, but left to follow them in pride | Ru P 1.212 Perhaps I was given a bit of Childe Harold instead | Stevenson T 291 he was given a lodge to keep | id B 135 For what reason had he been given this chamber? | Hope Q 72 to take risks is what we were given life for | Wells L 94 They were given an address in Chelsea | id L 314 | id N 15 | Barrie T 278 I was given wings | Zangwill G 321 when she was given a bad mark for disorder | Harraden F 56 We have yet to be given a book on the marriage question | Shaw C 133 until we are given the string to tie them on | Doyle S 5.263 if he were given time to realise them | Galsw Frat 199 he had been given by Nature a single-minded view of life | Bennett Helen 57 Do you always have fish for tea? I have what I'm given.

Note that in the sense 'permitted (given the faculty) by Providence' the personal subject is never used: Lamb R 82 from the beginning of my calamities it was given to me to see the hand of man in them | Whittier 441 Nor is it given us to discern what threads the fatal sisters spun.

**15.3₂.** Synonyms of *give:* Sh All IV.1.98 thou art [fol. are] *granted* space | Wiv III.5.6 if I be *seru'd* such another tricke | Galsworthy D 192 it was as if he had been *handed* the key of Paradise | Black F 2.220 he had been *dealt* four aces | Caine E 493 as if he had been *dealt* a blow.

*Pay* (cp the frequent construction as in *he is paid for his trouble*, without indication of what is given in payment): Swift J 378 I shall never be paid it | Franklin 196 As to my

ballance, I am not paid it to this day | Norris O 446 How much were you paid?

*Leave:* McCarthy 2.266 he was left but a short time to enjoy it | Hope Q 319 she was left no resource but love | Harraden F 132 I am not left any choice. — I have only recent examples, apart from the one found in Towneley Pl. 101 "All my shepe ar gone, I am not left oone", which appears to me rather doubtful; one would rather expect *have* than *am* = I have not one left. Qy: should we read: "I am now left oone" = I am alone, lonely?

*Vouchsafe, allow,* etc.: Mi PL XII 622 Such favour I unworthie am *voutsaft* | Merriman S 50 She had been vouchsafed for a moment a vision of herself | Sh Hml V.1.255 Yet here she is *allow'd* her virgin crants | Swift 3.234 they might be allowed the liberty to speak | Goldsm V 2.94 you are allowed here nothing but straw | Thack N 11 I was allowed none [no innocent pleasure] (frequent in Thack) | McCarthy 2.59 He was *assigned* a residence in Bithoor and a large pension | ib 2.283 He was not *afforded* any opportunity | Zangwill G 208 He was *accorded* an interview with Miss Brent | Mi A 24 they must be *licenc'd* what they may say.

**15.3₃.** *Promise:* Sh Mcb I.5.14 ignorant of what greatnesse is promis'd thee ... Glamys thou art and Cawdor, and shalt be what thou art promis'd | Swift J 40 to-morrow I am to have an answer, and am promised an effectual one | Defoe R 110 when they were promis'd flesh to eat | Franklin 178 they were promised a gill of rum a day | Stevenson M 273 He was promised something good | Ward E 271 he was promised consideration.

*Offer, bid:* Straw III.1.1 this wrong that I am offered | Gay BP 100 he was never offer'd such an indignity | Scott Iv 274 it is the true part of a friar to accept refreshment, if you are offered any | Macaulay H 2.72 They were offered their lives if they would consent | Morris N 44 we were offered baskets of fine fruit | Shaw 1.XVI when they are offered a play || Austen E 27 he had been bid more for his wool than any body.

**15.3₄.** *Deny, refuse:* Sh R 2 II.3.129 I am *denyde* to sue my liuerie here | (cp Err IV.4.67) | Sterne 49 he would be denied the benefits of the last sacraments | Brontë P 170 I was denied admission to your presence | Hope M 122 I have been denied an heir of my body | Wilde P 20 we are denied the one thing that might heal us | M'Carthy 2.343 they were *refused* admittance | Marl E 892 I'l not be *bard* the court for Gaueston | ib 1973 We are *depriude* the sun-shine of our life [now always *deprive one of sth*].

*Forbid:* Franklin 81 I was forbidden the house | Carlyle S 67 I was forbid much | Locke HB 170 he being forbidden potatoes by his medical man.

**15.3₅.** *Wish* (rare): Di N 448 How dare you talk about anything else till you have been wished many happy returns of the day?

*Order, command:* Gay BP 85 I am *order'd* immediate execution | Swift J 41 I beg you to tell it to no person alive; for so I am ordered | Black F 317 she was ordered a long rest | Chesterton B 72 in our day she would have been ordered air and sunlight and activity | AV Ex 34.34 hee came out and spake vnto the children of Israel, that which he was *commanded* (rare).

**15.3₆.** *Owe* (rare) Hardy R 151 what I am owed | Harraden F 99 you will feel that you are owed some compensation | Campbell Shl 140 my knowledge of ... what you are owed by mankind | NP '22 France must get from Germany what she is owed.

**15.3₇.** *Spare, save:* Shelley P 294 you will be spared the suffering and I the virtue | Austen P 337 you have been spared something of these distressing scenes | GE Mm 27 she was spared any inward effort | Stevenson MB 202 She is spared neither hint nor accusation | Morris N 67 she is spared the fear || Austen S 218 she was saved the trouble.

**15.3₈.** *Cause:* We were caused much trouble.

*Make* (rare) Fielding T 4.313 Am I not made amends?

I have no examples with *do*, and English friends do not recognize such sentences as: he was done wrong | she was done another favour |

I come to see a worthy man done justice. Goldsm writes (V 2.175) I am now come to see justice done a worthy man. — But it would be possible to say "he was done wrong to | I come to see a worthy man done justice to"; cf 15.7. "He was *meant* no harm" also would be inadmissible.

**15.3₉.** *Tell:* Sh Ado V.4.96 I was told, you were in a consumption | Bunyan P 169 I was told, that he scattered ... | Swift I 299 I am told so much | Austen S 191 She was told it by a particular friend | Quincey 224 if I had been told of them when waking | Macaulay L 2.291 he had been told by the American minister that ... | Ru P 1.176 desire to know what I could never more be told | Wilde S 159 We are not told the history of her love | Barrie T 323 it seemed to her that she had been told it by him || cf BJo 3.195 you were *put in the head*, that she was gone.

*Show:* Gay BP 102 the favour I was then shown | Goldsm V 1.21 when we were shewn a room | Spencer F 150 you are shown that this boulder rolled down.

*Teach:* Defoe G 56 they are taught like gentlemen, that is, taught nothing | Austen P 453 I was taught what was right. Nowadays *he was not taught French at school* is the usual construction; it would be unnatural to say *French was not taught him at school*, except if *French* is emphasized and if it is followed up with "but Latin was". As it is sometimes said that *teach* in English takes two accusatives, it is worth repeating that OE *tæcan* took dative + acc.; it is different from Lat. *docere* and G. *lehren*.

*You* may be nom. or oblique in Sh R 3 I.3.250 you would be taught your duty. Gill (1621, 99) takes *yü* as the acc. in "yü shal bi tauht beter manerz". — Very often we have only a subject and no retained object: Roister 27 I am taught already | Ward R 1.286 She holds the old ideas as she was taught | French is not taught at that school. Cf 14.9₆.

With regard to the verbs mentioned 14.3₄ it is to be noticed that *cost* is never used in the passive. One English professor, whom I asked, thought it quite possible and even current to say "Tom was bet a shilling", less so to add "by him", while another professor of English would not admit either and thought *betted* the proper form; while the former thought the sentence "a great deal of money was bet on

that horse" all right, the latter would admit only "laid, put".

**15.41.** As a rule the retained object does not show by its form that it is not the subject; but the oblique form *them* shows this: Sh Wint IV.4.237 [ribbons] I was promis'd them against the feast | Ward R 1.286 She holds the old ideas as she was taught them | Maxwell EG 421 you read my thoughts — you don't really need to be told them.

It is worth mentioning that though "we were shown a room" and "a room was shown us" are permissible and unambiguous, "he was shown us" is ambiguous and therefore generally avoided; the preposition *to* makes the meaning clear, as in Fielding 7.26 he had been shewn to her from the window. "We were offered them as substitutes" is ambiguous, but "We were offered him as a substitute" is not, on account of the singular number of the last word.

**15.42.** Sometimes we find an author using the old and the new construction side by side: Sh Macb (above 15.33) | Scott Iv 397 Is it permitted to me to reply? Speak, you are permitted | Thack N 706 had the wretched soul been allowed leisure to pause . . . But the pause was not allowed her.

**15.43.** The new construction is not equally permissible with all verbs. It would probably be difficult to find examples like these: he was *written* a letter, *sent* a note, *telegraphed* the number, or she was *got* a glass of wine, or *done* an injustice (cf however *sent* in the quotation from Wilde, above 15.26). There is something capricious in this; but certainly the construction has been gaining in favour throughout the Modern English period in spite of the strong animosity against it on the part of grammarians of the old type, who could not class it according to their preconceived (Latin) ideas.

This feeling, as well as the strength of the tendency to use this construction is seen, for instance, when Leslie Stephen told Maitland that "he had tried hard [NB] to keep out of the Dictionary [of National Biography] such phrases

as 'he was given an appointment', 'he was awarded the prize" (L 265). Those who think that grammatical questions should be decided by the usage of great authors, may find some comfort in the number of famous writers quoted above. Even so fastidious a writer as Macaulay uses the new construction with *promise*, *offer*, *deny*, *allow*, *forbid*, *refuse* (Thum, Anmerk. 133). Lounsbury SU 182ff. has quotations from 43 of the greatest names in English literature from Spenser to Stevenson.

**15.44.** More important, however, than this array of authors, is the consideration that the new construction with the indirect object made the subject of the passive, while producing no ambiguities or other inconveniences worth mentioning, increases the ease and freedom of the language, and adds considerably to its stylistic resources, as the reader will easily see if he will try to render the same thoughts as are found in the above quotations by means of the old passive construction. Note especially the facility with which the new subject may be made at the same time the subject either (a) of a verb in the active, or (b) of an ordinary passive — combinations which it would be impossible to translate into such a language as Latin:

(a): Tenn L 2.99 brothers who have all either bought or been left estates | Gosse, Eight. Cent. Lit. 237 he was offered, and declined, the office of poet-laureate | Fitz Gerald [Bookm. Oct. 05. 34] [Dickens] was more anxious to be told, rather than to tell, an amusing story | Collier E 377 Wherever woman has assumed, or been accorded, this unfortunate prominence, it has meant decay | Benson D 2.270 how hungry a murderer would be if he was taken out to be hanged before breakfast, and then given his breakfast afterwards | Wells Polly 165 At first Mr. P. stood and was stood drinks | id Ma 1.182 Marjorie pleaded a headache very wisely, and was taken a sympathetic cup of tea.

(b): Austen M 218 I think the house may be made comfortable and given the air of a gentleman's residence | GE Mm 175 She had been led through the best galleries, had

been shown the grandest ruins and the most glorious churches | Benson N 193 ... rabbits, who are given various diseases and then studied with loving attention | Galsw P 6.56 you've been given fair trial and found guilty | Finnemore Social Life 119 Sometimes he was not given a choice at all, but handed over to the recruiting sergeant.

On the analysis of the passive constructions dealt with in this chapter, see 14.1$_2$.

It should be noted that similar circumstances have led to the development of the same passive construction in the Scandinavian languages, though not to the same extent as in English. Examples H. C. Andersen Alt paa sin r. plads: det var just ham, som havde været til spot og var budt øl i en strømpe | Lange Breve 2.2 Han skulde ud af en tragedie og anvises plads i landstinget | Ibsen Borkmann 168 Så det behøver du da alligevel at indprænte udefra? | Lie Jernteppet 234 Vi er forundt en halv time til at leve vor lykke i. For Swedish cf Noreen, Vårt språk 5.591.

### Passive of Verbs with two direct objects.

**15.5.** Some of the verbs mentioned in 14.9 admit two passive constructions, while others are used only with the name of a person (the first object) as the passive subject.

*Strike:* he was struck a heavy blow | a heavy blow was struck him (not quite so usual).

*Envy:* "he was envied his luck" is the normal passive; "his luck was envied him" is barely possible.

*Hear:* Fielding T 2.249 he desired only to be heard one short word | Stupid boys were heard their lessons; but "Lessons, (or Some lessons, French lessons), were heard stupid boys" seems quite impossible.

*Answer:* "he was answered nothing" is quite possible — but not: "he was answered some questions". On the other hand "nothing was answered him" would only be conceivable in reply to the question "What answer was given him", and even then would not be considered good.

*Ask:* Defoe Rox 187 if they were asked any questions about her | Di T 2.286 they are asked some question | Ru C 89 You don't like to be asked such rude questions | Locke

FS 214 I don't see why I should be asked such a question. — "No question was asked my brother" is possible, but infinitely less common than "my brother wasn't asked any question".

*Take:* Thack S 23 his Royal Highness was taken an airing ... The Princess was taken a drive (but not: a drive was taken the Princess).

*Forgive:* "he was forgiven his impudence" and "his impudence was forgiven him" are both current. AV has only the latter construction: Matt. 9.5 Thy sinnes be forgiuen thee.

*Excuse:* "he was excused lessons today" is quite normal, but most people would object to "Lessons were excused him today", though the objection would not be so strong if the subject was more specific: "his geography lesson was excused him". — Defoe Rox 2 I must be excused to give it [my character] as impartially as possible.

*Call:* he was called names by everybody (but not: names were called him).

*Kiss:* he was kissed good-night (but not: good-night was kissed him).

*Dismiss, banish:* Defoe M 39 I expected every day to be dismissed the family | Richardson G 24 if he should be dismissed our service | Southey L 93 he was sentenced to be dismissed the ship | Housman J 331 I am dismissed the [police] force | More U 84 some peere of Englande, that is bannyshed his countrey | Bunyan G 119 you must be banished the realm. (Never the inverse order).

*Let blood:* AR 112 he was þus ileten blod (thus at least 5 times in AR) | Sh R 3 III.1.183 (his adversaries) are let blood | GE A 272 I wish he war [dial.] let blood. Never: blood was let him.

*Paint*, etc.: the door was painted a different colour; never with the colour as subject.

### "He was sent for and taken care of".

**15.61.** What in the active is the object of a preposition connected with a verb or with a verb and its object may be

made the subject of a passive construction. This phenomenon may be called a correlate of those dealt with in 13.9: in both we see that the particle has greater cohesion with the verb than with what (in the active) is the object either of the particle alone (preposition) or of the whole phrase.

Sweet NEG § 396 here speaks of a "detached" preposition; but if it is detached from the object, it is on the other hand connected with the verb.

**15.62.** First we give examples of the simple phrase, and, as above, in the first place some in which the case is not shown: Malory 67 I wylle that my moder be *sente for* ... the quene was sente for | More U 188 whyche is more to bee *marueled at* | ib 228 olde age ... should unkyndlye be *delte withall* | Marlowe J 1416 Nought is to be *look'd for* | ib 2115 this must be *look'd into* | Sh R 2 III.3.101 the king Should so ... Be *rush'd upon* | Gent II.4.183 all the means Plotted, and *'greed on* | Hml III.4.201 'tis so *concluded on* | AV Matth 20.28 the sonne of man came not to be *ministred vnto*, but to minister | Mi A 18 where that immortal garland is to be *run for* | ib 21 how shall the licencers themselves be *confided in*? | Swift J 18 Manley has been *complained of* for opening letters | Lamb E 1.25 Any complaint was sure of being *attended to* | Austen P 340 how is such a man to be *worked on*? | Carlyle H 59 the thing to be *gone-upon* in speculation | Di Do 120 that was not going to be *submitted to*, was it? | Macaulay E 4.286 Cheyte Sing was *called upon* to pay an extraordinary contribution | Ru Sel 1.367 the general principles cannot be *added to* | Ru S 192 [day] the longest of our time and best, *looked back on*, will be but as a moment | Holmes A 216 this peculiar habit ... may be *fallen into* by very good people | Kipl L 103 it [success] is not *got at* by sacrificing other people | Barrie M 151 it has been honestly *come by* | Doyle R 110 the bed had not even been *lain upon* | Aumonier OB 236 something incorruptible that may always *be gone back to*.

**15.63.** Verbal substantives or infinitives are seen in: Sh Cymb II.4.23 [Cæsar] found their courage Worthy his *frowning at* | Mered T 76 The desire of her bosom was to be

*run away with* in person | Austen E 50 do not be *run away with* by gratitude and compassion | Walpole Cp 123 she would like ... to look after him perhaps, and to be *looked after* by him.

**15.6₄.** Note the complex prepositional phrases in: Hawth 1.506 should all the above business be reasonably *got through with* | Norris O 294 The farce ... was solemnly *gone through with* at Ruggles's office | NP '24 when you wonder whether your telephone is being *listened in on* || Di T 1.132 That's a fair young lady to be pitied by and *wept for by!*

**15.6₅.** In the following instances we have a case-distinguishing pronoun as the subject: Maundeville 22 Thei ben *sent fore*, also Malory 35, Caxton R 19, Marl E 738 | Caxton R 8 that he is thus *complayned on* | ib 66 therfore am I *complayned on* of the euyl shrewys | id B 42 he was well *loked vpon* of all | More M 73 he himself was oftener *laughed at* then his iestes were (ib 262) | ib 196 if they be *passed by* | ib 186 thoughe he be ... *poynted to* of vs even with our fynger | Latimer Spec. III.21.46 they wyl not be yl *spoken of* | Sh H 4 I.2.225 Being wanted, he may be more *wondred at* | ib I.3.154 we ... liue scandaliz'd, and fouly *spoken of* | Merch II.6.48 we are *staid for* at Bassanio's feast | Sh Hml IV.5.130 Ile not be *iuggel'd with* | Bacon A 5.12 we should be *sent to* | AV Job 15.22 he is *waited for* | 1 Cor 10.30 Why am I euill *spoken of*? | Swift 3.379 This I could not be *prevailed on* to accept | Defoe G 31 when he was *spoken with* by the minister | Fielding T 2.142 she was *lain-with* by half the young fellows at Bath | Goldsmith 114 I am *laughed at* by the whole world | Franklin 10 he was *prevailed with* to accompany them | Austen P 439 I can be *worked on* | Kipl M 188 she had been *proposed to* by every single man at mess | Mered H 45 he might be reckoned upon to respect it | Doyle S 6.117 I was *wired for* | Locke FS 123 I have been *telegraphed for* | Haggard S 24 a witness who can be *relied upon* to hold his tongue | Shaw 2.135 She couldnt bear being *read to* any longer | id P 264 I'll not be intimidated or *talked back to* | Galsw FM 149 we must do as we'd be *done by*.

I quote here some unusual combinations: Brontë W 12 I'll not say what he shall *be done to* [more usual: what shall be done to him] | Butler Build. Am. Nation 211 Jackson's military instincts and military skill were quickly *availed of* [in the active *avail oneself of*] | Bennett LR 48 She had the charm of passivity. She was made not to do, but to be *done unto* [from the biblical phrase *ministered unto* 15.6₂].

Note that though it is possible to say, e. g., "he was bowed to", it is not possible to say "he was suggested to" or "dedicated to"; and though we may say "we told the secret to him", we cannot say "he was told the secret to", which without *to* is all right. Note also the difference between "he was spoken to" [= people spoke to him] and "he was told to" [= people told him to, with *to* as a representative of an infinitive].

**15.6₆.** Similar passives of more complicated verbal phrases: Austen M 37 she was quite ready to be *fallen in love with* | Carlyle F 3.216 for the exclusive purpose of falling in love, or being fallen in love with | GE Mm 108 Rosamond was rather used to be fallen in love with | Gissing B 512 we shan't be *fought shy of* | Benson D 2.298 I have been *got rid of* in other ways.

**15.6₇.** Phrase-participles may be used in other combinations than with *be:* Sh H4A I.2.230 But when they [i. e. holidays] seldome come, they *wisht-for* come | Harraden F 307 it [the room] does not look *lived in* | Aust M 301 Shakespeare one gets *acquainted with* without knowing how.

It is rather unnatural to use a phrase-participle as subject: Tenn L 1.9 Sender and *sent-to* go to make up this.

It is worth noting here the negative participles of these phrases; examples in adjunct use have been given II 13.34 (your *vnthought-of* Harry, etc.); other examples are:

Sh John II.1.79 How much *vnlook'd for* is this expedition | Tw V. 317 I leaue my duty a little *vnthought of* | Mi PL 2.821 dire change Befalln us unforeseen, *unthought of* | Cowper L 1.108 you will not again leave us *unwritten to* for a fortnight | Butler W 230 a letter like this — so *unled up to.*

**15.7₁.** Even a phrase consisting of a transitive verb,

its object, and a preposition, may be treated in the same way in the passive; a first germ of this construction is contained in AR 362 Nes Seinte Peter & Seinte Andreu istreiht o rode ... and loðlease meidenes *þe tittes ikoruen of*, and to-hwiðered o hweoles, & hefdes bikoruen? The only other examples I have before the 18th c. are: Mandv 89 so was this cursed king never *made sorwe for*, as he supposed for to have ben | North 237 their bodies were *layed hold on.*

**15.72.** Examples which do not show the case in the subject: Carlyle S 29 new means must of necessity be *had recourse to* | Di D 286 he was too rheumatic to be *shaken hands with* | GE Mm 197 surprised at her beauty being *made so much of* | Ru T 190 all men shall be looked after and *taken note of* | Mered H 73 to be *played the fool with* by idiots and women | Shaw Ms 95 Your women are kept idle and dressed up for no other purpose than to be *made love to* | Wells H 319 respectable enough to be *shaken hands with* by George and Mary | the original purpose was gradually *lost sight of.*

**15.73.** With case-distinguishing pronouns as subjects: Fielding 5.455 I was more *taken notice of* by some gentlemen | Goldsm V 2.211 she was now *made an honest woman of* | Franklin 48 I was more taken notice of | Austen P 42 She will be *taken good care of* (also Scott A 2.317) | Di D 453 he was well taken care of (also Ru S 57) | Di T 1.86 (vg) I won't be *took the liberty with* | Brontë V 1 One child in a household of grown people is usually made very much of, and in a quiet way I was a good deal *taken notice of* by Mrs. Bretton | Thack N 59 He is *made much of* | Troll B 410 he allowed himself to be *made prey of* | Mered H 56 he had been *got the better of* | Shaw J 20 And here I am, *made a man of*, as you say, by England | McKenna Sh 61 I hate *being found fault with* | Walpole Cp 450 I was to be *made a fighting-ground of.*

In nearly all the modern sentences we have set phrases consisting of a verb with a short object without any qualifying words. It is not possible to say, for instance, "he was found many grave faults with". Adjuncts like *any* or *no* can, however, be added in some cases: he was never *taken*

*any notice of*, he was *taken no notice of*. — The following expression is not quite natural: Di N 432 He must be *done something with*.

**15.74.** The ordinary grammatical school-analysis has some difficulty with these constructions; in *I was taken notice of* it will evidently not do to say that *I* is the subject of *was taken*, and *notice* the object of *taken;* but in reality nothing hinders us from saying that *take notice of* is a verbal phrase governing an object *(me)*, which can be made into the subject if the whole phrase is turned into the passive. Cf similar analyses in 14.12, 11.66, 11.8 (In *this must be got rid of* we must also say that the passive is formed of the whole phrase *get rid of*, as *get* in itself in that sense cannot be made into a passive).

Here, too, we have analogous constructions in Scandinavian languages, thus Paludan-Müller Ad. Homo IX: at nu han peges fingre ad som een, Der ikke meer kan staae paa egne been | Björnson Nye fort. 37 to vakre mennesker er i Frankrige altid sikre paa at blive lagt mærke til.

## Converted Subjects.

**15.81.** Very often the passive turn is used without any express indication of what in the corresponding active construction would be the subject: *it is believed* (= people believe) | *it is generally believed* (most people believe), etc.

If it is necessary or convenient to add an express indication of what would be the subject in the active — the converted subject — this is done by means of a preposition. OE here used *from* or *of;* the former soon became obsolete, while *of*, which was the regular preposition in early ME, has been retained till the present day, though now chiefly in literary and rather archaic usage. From about 1400 *by*, which originally meant what is now expressed by *through* or *through the means of*, became more and more usual before the converted subject. In Sh Hml I.1.25 the received text has "this dreaded sight twice seene of vs", but Q 1 has "by vs".

**15.82.** *Of* is "most frequent after pa. pples. expressing

a continued non-physical action (as in *admired*, *loved*, *hated*, *ordained of)*, or a condition resulting from a definite action (as in *abandoned*, *deserted*, *forgotten*, *forsaken of*") NED. Examples: Marl F 306 most dearely lou'd of God | Sh R 3 IV.4.102 For she that scorn'd at me, now scorn'd of me: For she being feared of all, now fearing one: For she commanding all, obey'd of none | Sh Ven 718 expected of my friends | AV Mat 2.12 being warned of God | ib 2.16 hee was mocked of the wise men | Dryden 5.331 of all forsaken, and forsaking all | Bunyan G 33 I am possessed of the Devil | Defoe Rox 37 I was abandoned of a husband in the prime of my youth | Barrie TG 95 To be the admired of women | ib 311 It was Tommy who was the favoured of the gods | Wilde Int 132 he who has mercy for the condemned of God | Merriman S 11 I am hated of all the peasants | Bennett Cd 24 The envied of all, Denry walked home | id A 70 the sinners stricken of the Spirit | Norris S 162 shunning men and shunned of women. — Note here the frequency of the definite article before the participle (which is thus a primary).

**15.8₃.** *Beloved of* is especially frequent; in Sh *beloved* has always *of*, never *by*. A modern example: Ward El 218 that frank contempt which makes the English race so beloved of Europe.

Another frequent phrase is *understanded of the people* (from the Thirty-nine Articles, Stoffel S 168).

*Of* is not infrequent after participles beginning with *un-:* Marl F 875 unseen of any (also Behn 321) | Di Do 364 So Edith's mother lies unmentioned of her dear friends.

**15.8₄.** *Afraid* is originally the participle of *affray*, but is no longer felt as a participle; it takes *of*, and the same is the case with the synonymous participle *frightened:* Locke CA 4 this made me frightened of the hereditary career that my father had mapped out for me | Walp Cp 204 I've been frightened of every one lately. This, however, can hardly be called a real converted subject; if we have a real passive, *by* is used. Both prepositions are seen in Mackenzie PR 232

I'm always frightened by people when I meet them first. Though curiously enough I was never frightened of you.

*Born of* hardly belongs to this class, for it is not usual to say "she bore a daughter" (for: she gave birth to a daughter). *Of* in *born of* means provenience from.

**15.85.** It is not necessary here to give examples of *by* before a converted subject, but a few may be given in which the two prepositions are found side by side: Bunyan P 211 they think that those fears are wrought by the devil, though indeed they are wrought of God | Dickinson S 141 poets who have been born of the people and loved of them ... the literature loved by democracy.

*By* is rare with adverbs formed from participles: Austen S 152 thither she one day abruptly, and very unexpectedly by them, asked them to accompany her.

**15.86.** *With* from indicating the instrument sometimes comes to be used before a converted subject: struck with | he was seized with cramp | Marl J 395 Why stand you thus vnmov'd with my laments? | Twain H 1.100 bit with a snake | Walpole Cp 357 All the roses were eaten with green flies.

**15.87.** After *known*, *to* is frequent: Austen M 137 a young man very slightly known to any of us | Hardy R 354 How long has he known of this? Well, it was known to him this morning early. Note the two prep.s in Collier Engl 32 A man's intimate friends for years, men he has known at school, at the club, are often quite unknown to, or by, his wife. (What is the difference?).

---

## Chapter XVI.

## Transitivity.

**16.0.** It is customary to divide verbs into *transitive* and *intransitive*. But in English at any rate, it is impossible to make a sharp distinction between two *classes*, and we should rather speak of a transitive and an intransitive *use* of verbs, for many verbs which are generally transitive,

i. e. take an object (or two objects), are very often used without any object, and other verbs, which are as a rule intransitive, may at times be connected with an object. Sometimes the distinction is made in such a way that, for instance, *change* is said to be *intransitive* in "the weather changes", but to be used *absolutely* in "you must change at Wigan"; correspondingly with *smoke* in "the chimney smokes" and "Thanks, I don't smoke"—an object being understood in the latter, but not in the former case. This distinction, however, has no great significance, and it is not necessary to multiply grammatical terms.

In this chapter we shall deal with the double use of a great many verbs and show how the transitive and intransitive employments have sometimes nearly the same meaning, while in other cases they have more or less different meanings. Very often it is difficult to know which of the two uses is the original one. Sometimes the double use goes back to OE, e. g. *scacan* shake, *wyrcan* work, *meltan* melt; sometimes OE differences have been levelled out in course of time: MnE *sink* corresponds to OE *sincan* intransitive and *sencan* transitive; *burn* to OE *biernan beornan* intransitive and *bærnan* transitive, cf below 16.7$_8$ on *hang*. In some cases a French verb had already in that language a double employment (*change*, *pass*); and finally we have some verbs in which the double employment is of quite recent growth through a variety of circumstances. It seems practical in a grammar dealing with modern English to distinguish the following classes, though it must be admitted that there is a good deal of overlapping:

(1) an ordinary object omitted;
(2) a reflexive pronoun omitted;
(3) a reciprocal pronoun omitted;
(4) verbs of movement and change;
(5) verbs derived from adjectives, etc.;
(6) verbs derived from substantives;
(7) causatives and inchoatives;
(8) activo-passive use of the verb.

Many verbs will be mentioned in two or more of these classes. Sometimes a N.B. draws attention to the fact that two different uses of one and the same verb occur in close proximity; cf also 16.4₄.

## Object Omitted.

**16.1₁.** The omission of an obvious object probably produces more intransitive uses of transitive verbs than anything else. "When we say, for example, that Miss A. *plays* well, only an irredeemable outsider would reply 'Plays what?' So, too, in certain circles, we shall be readily understood when we say that Miss B *paints* well or *draws* well; that C *throws* well or *kicks* well", says Mr Alphonso Smith (*Studies in Engl Synt.*, p. 8), who agrees with Bréal (*Essay de Sémantique*) that an abundance of such intransitive verbs is a "sign of civilization" or an effect of organization, as they will "increase in number just as men become more closely banded together, or as civilization succeeds in diffusing a common fund of information".

**16.1₂.** In many cases the object may be inferred from the situation (he *plays*, according to circumstances the piano, or football, etc.) or from the context (I *wrote* [a letter] to him a fortnight ago, but he hasn't *answered* [my letter] yet). Cf also Sh Merch I 3.62 I neither *lend* nor *borrow* | ib IV 1.280 if the Iew do *cut* but deepe enough | Meas I 4.81 When maidens sue Men *giue* like gods | Galsw C 66 I've been *drinking*, but I'm not drunk. Compare also the three stages: he *left* this place yesterday | he left here yesterday (1. 1₁) | he left yesterday. In such cases it is easy to supply some definite word or words as the object of the verb.

**16.1₃.** But in many sentences the object understood is so vague that several words might be equally well supplied, see below the examples with *bear*, *take*, etc. In several instances the verb as used intransitively has in some combinations acquired a slightly different sense from the habitual

one, as when *answer* is used (differently from the usage just exemplified) in the sense 'to answer the purpose, be suitable'; note also the difference between "he does not *pay* well" and "the business does not *pay*" where we may doubt if *pay* is = 'pay expenses' or = 'pay itself' (cf German *es bezahlt sich nicht*, Dan. *det betaler sig ikke*). Cf also *his voice does not carry far* [*c.* the sound? or *c.* itself, or activo-passive?]. Sometimes a verb may become intransitive in more ways than one, as *change* (cf below 16.4₁ and = 'change one's clothes' or 'change train or carriages'.) *Recover* 'come back to health' may be from *recover oneself* or *recover health*, though more likely the former.

When *keep* means' stay, lodge, live' in a certain place (frequent in Sh., etc., Shelley 730 the chamber where the women kept; often used at college), this may either be an extension of the ordinary intransitive meaning 'continue', or else the reflexive pronoun, or some object, like 'house' may be said to be omitted. *Put up* in the same sense originated in the omission of 'one's horses' (rather than 'oneself', as NED suggests), cf also *pull up*; and *stop* may have acquired the same sense in either way.

**16.1₄.** Examples of verbs without objects (arranged alphabetically): this *adds* to our difficulties | Austen M 62 everything *answered* | Hope Ch 102 does the ice *bear*? | Di D 307 she asked if the table would bear | Stevenson JHF 22 small sounds *carried* far | the fire *caught* rapidly | Hope Z 130 I can't open it. The latch has caught | Goldsm 627 a short letter to Sir William will *do* | Di D 19 it won't do. No! No price could make it do | ib 46 ask P. if I did not do very well when I was not interfered with | Austen M 28 astonished to find how very well they did even without his father | I can't do without money | there's another train to *follow* | Wells T 50 his knees seemed to *give* [= give way] | Malet C 40 As Julius rose, his knees gave under him | ib 63 Ormiston would have liked to maintain that same insolence of demeanour, but it gave before an apprehension of serious issues | Norris P 225 he had "*hung up*" [h. up the

telephone] | she has *left* for London | Spect 166 we saw him *make up* to us | Thack N 286 the Colonel would have liked me to make up to her [cp. make for the harbour, etc.] | Goldsm 621 you *mistake*, my dear | If I mistake not [= am not mistaken] | Jacobs S 31 If the place really *pays*, it will keep on | Ward E 279 She is so ill and tired . . . She will *pick up* when she gets to England [i. e. pick up health] | Wells N 270 the conversation suddenly picked up and became good | he knows where the shoe *pinches* | to *propose* to a woman [= p. marriage, Bennett W 2.164] | Ridge G 221 the doctor said he very much doubted whether Winnie would *pull through* | *pull* = 'row' | *put* to sea | a horse *rears* (orig. rears its legs = 'raises') | Di D 562 my aunt and Dora's aunts *rubbed on* much more smoothly than I could have expected | *send* for a person | Hankin 2.125 Verreker *shrugs* [rare, i. e. his shoulders] | *shut up* (sc. one's mouth, vg. = be silent) | *smoke* (tobacco) | Di N 305 Where's the lady *stopping*—with Mrs. Crummles? | the railway-men threaten to *strike* [work] | Hope D 11 his son *takes* after him | Di D 202 she took so kindly to me | Defoe R 2.114 his stratagem took.

**16.1₅.** We may here mention also the usual phrase *I know* (= I know what you mean, what you are alluding to) and similarly: Yes, I *see* | I *remember* | I had *forgotten* | How can I *tell*? In such cases other languages generally use some pronoun corresponding to E. *it* as object: *das weiß ich*, *je le sais*, etc.

**16.1₆.** If *marry* is used in this way without any object, it means 'to enter into the married state', and on account of the various objects the verb can take (he marries her | the clergyman marries them, 12.5₂) *marry* therefore comes to mean practically the same thing as *be married*; N.B. More U 224 the woman *is* not *maried* before she be 18 yeres olde. The man is 4 yeres elder before he *mary* | Maugham PV 30 If she wanted to *marry* just to *be married* there were a dozen boys who would jump at the chance | Wells V 218 He must *have married* when he was quite a young man.

Didn't you know he *was married*? | Bennett T 182 I've often thought about *marrying*, of course. I might *get married* some day.

**16.17.** Several words for producing various sounds are generally used without an object, e. g. *talk*, *speak*, *whisper*, *lisp*, *whistle*, but they may also be used with an object: *he talks nonsense*, *speaks his mind*, *whispers the secret*, *lisps his consonants*, *whistles a melody*. Though historically this is the opposite of what happens with the verbs considered above, the actual result is practically the same: *he talks*: *he talks nonsense*; *he drinks: he drinks whisky*.

**16.18.** I place here *mistake* (transitive in *mistake one's way*, etc.) though I am not certain how the intransitive use originated; examples: (frequent in Sh, see Sh-lex) | Defoe R 2.189 I mistook in my guesses | Goldsm V 1.49 You mistake there | Di F 105 If I don't mistake. This is now rare, except perhaps in journalese: unless we mistake. Otherwise the passive turn is used *you are mistaken* (oldest ex. in NED from Sh). Defoe R 2.207 my mate was much mistaken in his calculation.—Another verb with the same prefix, *miscarry*, is generally intransitive (as in Swift J 210 none of my letters did ever miscarry, etc.) though the simple verb *carry* is generally transitive (to class 4 below).

**16.19.** In the dialect of West Somerset (see Elworthy's *Grammar*, p. 191ff.) a curious distinction is made between a transitive and an intransitive *form* of the same verb, the latter adding a short [-i], thus—transcribing Elworthy's notation approximately—[ai də dig ðə graun) or [ai digz ðə graun], but [ai də digi] or [ai digəs]; [ðiː ziŋ ðik zoŋ], but [ziŋi lig ə mɛːən] 'sing thou that song', 'sing like a man'. The *-i* originates in the OE ending *-ian*, which has been specialized in its application and restricted to one particular meaning at the same time that it has been generalized by being extended to all verbs. The distinction is somewhat similar to the one found in Magyar between the 'objective' and 'subjective' conjugation *írom* 'I write' (with a definite object, *it*, etc.) and *írok* 'I write' (without such an object). Other foreign parallels see PG 158 note 2.

## Omission of Reflexive Pronouns.

**16.2₁.** In a great many cases the verb as used intransitively represents an older reflexive verb. The change of construction may have been brought about in two ways. In the older stages of the language the ordinary personal pronoun was used in a reflexive sense, but *me* in *I rest me*, originally in the accusative (he hine reste), might easily be felt as representing a 'dative of interest' (cf *I buy me a hat*, etc.) and thus be discarded as really superfluous. In the second place, after the *self*-pronouns had come to be generally used, the reflexive object in *I dress myself* might be taken to be the emphatic pronoun in apposition to the nominative (the difference in stress not being always strictly maintained) and thus might easily appear superfluous. The tendency is towards getting rid of the cumbersome *self*-pronoun whenever no ambiguity is to be feared; thus a modern Englishman or American will say *I wash*, *dress*, *and shave*, where his ancestor would add (*me*, or) *myself* in each case. One of the reasons for this evolution is evidently the heaviness of the forms *myself*, *ourselves*, etc., while there is not the same inducement in other languages to get rid of the short *me*, *se*, *mich*, *sich*, *mig*, *sig*, *sja*, etc. Hence also the development of the activo-passive use (below 16.8) in many cases where other languages have either the reflexive or the passive forms that have arisen out of the reflexive (Scand. *-s*, Russian *-sja*, *-s*.) Some of the verbs in class 4 below also may be explained as in this section: whether we take *ourselves* as a nominative or as the object in Tenn 290 "Do we *move ourselves*, or are we moved by an unseen hand?" in either case it is almost superfluous, as *move* in itself would impart the same meaning.

In nearly all the sentences collected below the most idiomatic phrase nowadays would be without *myself*, etc.; but naturally I have noted down more examples of the obsolete or obsolescent construction than of that familiar to every present-day Englishman.

**16.2₂.** Examples, arranged alphabetically:

Spect 164 they *apply* themselves to him for the decision | Fielding 3.517 Our hero next applied himself to another of his gang | Brontë J 393 no blame *attached* to me | Caine P 234 they *backed* themselves out of the room | Swift J 47 I *behaved* myself coldly enough to Mr. Addison | ib 80, 172 | Swift could not endure to hear the phrase *behaved—behaved what* he would say with some emotion. He once rebuked Lord Bathurst for this (UL 55) | Spect 173 how to behave | Shaw 2.246 My children know how to behave themselves | ib 290 he behaved badly | Harraden S 66 he has behaved himself rather well | Di D 321 a clergyman who has misbehaved himself | Shaw Ms *16 every time a child misbehaves itself. To allow the child to misbehave without instantly making it unpleasantly conscious of the fact [N.B.] Wells Fm 139 How well the picture has *bitten* into my brain | London M 34 though they had often bothered him, he had never *bothered* about them [N.B.] | Bacon A 4.34 we *bowed* our selves towards him | ib 21.19 wee bowed our selves [now never with *self* except in nexus-combinations like: he bowed himself out of the room, cf above *back*] | By 407 we who bow The necks of man, bow down before his throne [N.B.] | Sh R 2 I 2.42 may I *complain* my selfe | Err V 1.113 Complaine vnto the Duke of this indignity [now always without *self*] | he *declared* against the proposal | Di N 612 He was very respectful when he declared [= declared himself, i. e. his love] | Carpenter D 13 My life *divides* into four pretty distinct periods | Raleigh (NED) they *drew* themselves more westerly towards the Red sea | Lyly C 296 will you draw neere? | Hewlett Q 165 David drew back, and drew his companion back [N.B., cp. below *withdraw*] | Sh H 4 B II. 4.302 I *dress* my selfe handsome, till thy returne | H 4 A III 2.51 drest my selfe in such humilitie | Spect 6 he grew careless of himself and never dressed afterwards | Swift J 225 I dressed myself | ib 265 I dressed and shaved | id 3.377 I would not undress myself | GE A 96 she rose and began to dress herself very quietly | ib 369 they've dressed themselves out in that way | Brontë V 6 I am dressed,

Harriet. I have dressed myself [N.B.] | Thack N 715 he was actually getting up and dressing himself | Di D 550 I was in several minds how to dress myself on the important day | Mrs Carlyle 2.368 lots of time to dress myself | Caine P 191 Thora has dressed herself . . . she got up and dressed herself [*herself* is emphatic here, i. e. no one else dressed her; she was ill] | Benson D 2.85 he dressed rather too carefully to be really well-dressed [N.B.] | Bennett RS 130 She raised the blind and dressed; she was dressed in three minutes [N.B.] | Mackenzie S 620 Prince Raoul who was dressed as brightly as it was possible even for a prince to dress nowadays [N.B.] | Wells TM 21 I'm going to wash and dress, and then I'll come down | Di D 566 she had *engaged* to find a lodging | Lyly C 296 *feeding* them-selues, they fall into an extasie | Swift 3.337 while they were feeding | Caxton R 90 I *fele* me the lenger the werse | B Jo 3.18 I feel me going | Shelley 228 I feel Faint, like one mingled in entwining love | Di P 2.420 how she felt herself . . . she felt herself quite equal to it | Barrie T 65 I thought it would make me feel myself a boy again, but . . . I never felt so old as I do to-day [N.B.] | he *hides* behind the door (already Ch F 141) | Sh Ro II 1.30 he hath hid himselfe among these trees | Fielding 3.423 he may *indulge* himself in the full and free exertion of his abilities (cf 13.3a) | Spect 5 he *keeps* himself a bachelour by reason he was crossed in love | Di N 627 Those who had kept themselves cool to win, threw themselves upon the combatants | ib 632 they kept upon their guard | Stevenson T 71 A mate should keep himself to himself | Do keep quiet! | Stevenson JH 26 the fog *lifted* a little | Sh Tw I 5.49 bid the dishonest man *mend* himself, if he mend he is no longer dishonest [N.B.] | Johnson R 153 nothing else *offered* [most usual, perhaps, with *occasion* or *opportunity;* always, e. g., he offered himself as an interpreter] | *oversleep*, see 16.2e | Di N 653 she has *pined* herself away to nothing [now always *pine away*] | Sh Merch IV 1.324 Therefore *prepare* thee to cut off the flesh | Mess III 1.169 therefore prepare your selfe to death | Mids I 1.86 prepare

to dye | Defoe R 238 I was ready for action, if any thing had *presented* [frequent in Defoe, but not otherwise] | Kingsley H 277 I have, as usual, *proved* myself a fool | Sh Merch III 4.64 Ile proue the prettier fellow of the two | Phillpotts K 120 he *puzzled* in vain to conceive of any circumstances | Poe 256 apparently *recovering* himself | Stevenson B 215 I pray to the saints that ye will recover you of your hurt | Di N 670 when he had recovered | Straw IV 1.130 what I said, I *repent* not . . . So much I repent me [N.B.] | Sh both *I do repent me* and *repent it* | Lyly C 318 a thing that I repented mee of | Scott Iv 130 you shall not repent you of requiting the good deed | Ru F 105 a rich man may enter the kingdom of heaven without repenting him of his riches; but not the thief, without repenting his theft [N.B.] | Caxton R 86 I wil *reste* me | Sh Tp III 1.18 rest you . . . rest your selfe | ib III 3.6 Sit downe, and rest | Defoe M 164 I rested me a little | Kipl J 2.116 and so I fled and rested me (obsol.) | Fielding 8.387 to rest myself contented | Sh Oth II 3.386 *retire* thee | Sh R 2 IV 1.96 [he] retyr'd himselfe To Italy | H 5 III 3.56 we will retyre to Calis | Masefield S 160 he *roused* again at the battering clank of a train [ unusual; always: he roused himself from his reflexions] | Wells L 309 the young couple *settled* themselves into the little room | Swift J 134 I *shaved* | Di N 431 every morning before I shaved | Bennett LR 152 Apparently he must shave, or be shaved, every two hours [N.B.] | Sh Lr I 4.282 Ingratitude . . . More hideous when thou *shew'st* thee in a child | ib 289 O most small fault, How vgly did'st thou in Cordelia shew! | Hewlett Q 199 he plays with the King, his mouth broad, but no teeth showing. He shows neither his teeth nor his hand [N.B.] | Pinero Q 178 Muriel did not show at breakfast [more often with *herself*] | the disease *spread* rapidly | Stevenson M 32 I *stripped* to the skin | he *stole* home | Ch C 610 he stal him hoom agayn | Marl J 1008 But steale you in | Sh Ro II 1.4 he . . . hath stolne him home to bed | Spect 113 tears have stolen down my cheeks | Sh John III 1.194 Unlesse he doe *submit* him-

selfe to Rome | Peacock M 168 you see I am *training* for a philosopher myself [emphatic!] | Macaulay E 4.285 without *troubling* himself in the least about consistency | Dickinson R 24 I should not have troubled to write this chapter | id Im 9 Men do not trouble about death | AV Matth. 9.22 Jesus *turned* him about | Lyly C 284 turning himselfe to his cell | Sh Ant I. 3.76 turne aside, and weepe for her | Bunyan P 91 so I turned to go away from him: but just as I turned myself to go thence, I felt . . . [N.B.] | Spect 168 not to *venture* myself in it [the walk] after sun-set | Sh As IV 1.103 he went but forth to *wash* him in the Hellespont | Wiv III 3.167 I would I could wash my selfe of the buck | Shr IV 1.157 come Kate and wash | GE A 345 I'll go and wash myself now | ib 289 she fastened up her hair and began to wash | Tenn 253 And Thought leapt out to *wed* with Thought, Ere Thought could wed itself with Speech [N.B., cf *marry* 16.1₆] | Lyly C 301 *with-draw* your-selues | Sh both *w. me*, *myself*, and intransitively | AV never intransitively | Spect 117 to withdraw himself | Scott Iv 95 he would have probably withdrawn himself | Di N 626 to take measures for withdrawing himself from the connexion | ib 663 there is . . . no withdrawing | Ch HF 1988 I *wondred* me = Sh and mod.: I wondered | Sh Mcb V 8.23 *yeeld* thee, coward | ib V 8.12 a charmed life, which must not yeeld To one of woman borne.

**16.2₃.** *Feel* in *it feels cold in-doors* or *the bed feels hard* (Stephen L 188 Do you know what it feels like to be engaged?) belongs to class 8 and is different from *I feel cold* = I feel myself cold (class 2).

It is, perhaps, worth observing that while *I wash every morning* will naturally be understood as belonging to this class (= wash myself), the sentence *we wash every Monday* will just as naturally be taken according to class 1 (= *wash the linen*).

**16.2₄.** Sometimes there is a differentiation (or an incipient differentiation) between the use of the bare verb and the verb with a reflexive pronoun. *Behave oneself* is often used of good manners or breeding, while *behave* is used

of action generally. *The troops behaved gallantly under fire*—not *behaved themselves. He behaved* (or *behaved himself*) *properly. He behaved kindly to her* (never with *himself*). But "Did the child behave? Did the child behave itself well? Did the child behave itself? Did the child behave well," seem to be truly interchangeable. (In America also sometimes *he conducted well* = he conducted himself well) | *He subscribes himself J. C. Taylor, not John C. Taylor*, but never with the pronoun in *he subscribed to the war fund, he subscribes to an opinion* | *He settled himself comfortably in an easy-chair*, but *He settled in Australia* | *Dress* is used alone in the sense 'put on evening clothes' (for dinner, theatre, etc.); generally also in such combinations as "she dresses well | she dresses beyond her means". When the idea of disguise or fancy-dress is present, *up* is generally added, but *he dressed up as a Turk* merely draws attention to his costume, *he dressed himself up as a Turk*, to his action.

**16.25.** Not infrequently there is an element of volition or exertion in the reflexive form: he *recovered* from his long illness | Walp Cp 364 Grace sat down and tried to *recover herself* | he didn't *stir* | ib 274 I've felt so lazy . . . Now I must *stir myself* | Mason R 5 Deliberately her daughter had *withdrawn herself* among them [her dreams] . . . and she *withdrew* just a little more into the secret chamber of her dreams | he *proved himself* a fine fellow (emphasizes the exertion or at least the action more than) he *proved* a fine fellow (which means simply that people saw that he was) | you must *prepare yourself* for all emergencies (implies more effort than) you must *prepare* for all emergencies (which generally means 'be prepared for, expect') | we *kept ourselves* warm by walking to and fro (is more deliberate than) we *kept* warm, etc., though the difference is not always clear: *mind you keep warm*, or *mind you keep yourself warm.* Always *Keep cool!* without *yourself.* We now understand why it is impossible to add the reflexive pronoun in cases like the following, where the subject is not a living person:

*the assertion proved true* | *the dishes did not keep warm long.*

**16.2₆.** In some instances British and American usage is different, thus British "the Ohio empties itself into the Mississippi", in America without *itself*; inversely in America generally "I do not trouble myself to learn", in England without *myself*. 'He *qualified himself* for office' in America is giving way to 'he qualified' (J. M. Hart, *Engl. Composition* 167: but *qualify* in the same way may be heard in England, and NED has quotations from Burke and Macaulay). *I overslept myself* is usual in England by the side of *I overslept*, which is the only expression used in US. With other parallel formations the short expression is used in England: Wells Ma 2.201 he *overworked* (also Galsw TL 126, Bennett Lr 227, Maugham PV 219; NED has only an Amr example). NED quotes Thack: She has only *overeaten* herself. I find in an Amr book: Lewis MA 139 the small town bourgeois, who pay their debts and over-eat; but that may be heard in England too.

**16.2₇.** The use of *make* with a predicative (17.6₁) is, partly at any rate, to be explained through the omission of a reflexive pronoun. I shall give here some examples of the use with the pronoun: (NED 1350) Make we vs merie | Ch C 883 lat us . . . make us merie | Gower (NED) Iason made him bolde | Hughes T 68 he's sent to school to make himself a good scholar | Stev B 370 I make myself bold to feed your bones to foxes (archaic).

But in Di X 8 we have the emphatic, not the reflexive pronoun, as shown by the word-order: I don't make merry myself at Christmas, and I can't afford to make idle people merry.

**16.2₈.** In a similar way *get* may have acquired the frequent meaning 'become' through a reflexive employment. Also in the meaning 'succeed in coming or going' (*get away*, etc.) we may suspect some influence at least from the reflexive use in such formerly frequent phrases as *get thee hence* (e. g. AV Luke 13.31).

### Omission of Reciprocal Pronoun.

**16.31.** Some verbs are frequently used intransitively in the same signification as if the reciprocal pronouns *each other* or *one another* had been added as objects. Thus often *meet* (we met occasionally), *kiss* (they kissed and parted) already Ch C 968, Marl E 1799, *marry* (they married in haste and repented at leisure). In Shakespeare we have, besides the already mentioned verbs: *embrace*, *greet*, *hug*, *know*, *kill*, *love*, *see* (see Sh-lex s. v. *marry*, Franz² p. 278). A few examples of the less usual verbs may be added:

Sh H 6 C II 1.29 they ioyne, *embrace*, and seeme to kisse | H 8 I. 1.2 How haue ye done Since last we *saw* in France? [now never in this way] | As I. 1. 117 neuer two ladies *loued* as they doe | Hml IV 7.165 One woe doth tread vpon anothers heele, So fast they'l *follow* | Caine E 98 they walked down the staircase side by side . . . and almost *touching* | Walp Cp 153 Their hands touched.

Cp also: our letters *crossed.*

**16.32.** Reciprocity is sometimes indicated by means of the adverb *together* (cf Spies, Engl. Pron. im XV. u. XVI. Jh. 183, Franz § 312 note 2, Sh-lex. s. v. together). Mal 707 they . . . *kyssed to gyder* | ib 725 [Launcelot and the Queen] *loued to gyder* more hotter than they did to fore hand | Di N 384 They then *consulted together* on the safest mode... | ib 381 God send we may all *meet together* | they *fought together* | Wells TB 2.232 I put my arms about her and we *kissed together.*

### The *Move* and *Change*-Class.

**16.41.** This is a class of semantically related verbs, each with two meanings (1) to produce a movement or change in something, and (2) to perform the same movement or undergo the same change. How natural it is for such verbs to be thus doublefaced, appears from the fact that many, though not all, of the corresponding Danish, German, and French verbs have the same two meanings.

Examples:
*move* a stone. the stone moves.
*stir* the porridge. not a wind stirs.
*roll* a stone. the stone rolls.
*turn* the leaf. the current turns.
*change* the subject. the fashion changes.
*begin* the play. the play begins.
*commence* service. service commences at 11.
*end* the discussion. the meeting ended at 10.
*stop* the train. the train does not stop here.
*break* the ice. the ice breaks.
*burst* the boiler. the boiler bursts.
*boil* water. the water boils.
*pass* the wine. the train passed.
*drop* the subject. thus the matter dropped.
*shoot* the arrow. he shot past us.
*beat* the child. his heart beat violently.
*spread* manure. the news spread rapidly, 16.2₂.
*toss:* the ship is tossed by the waves. the ship tosses on the waves.
*blow up* the ship. the house blew up.
*shiver:* Spect 167 he shivered that lance all to pieces. she shivered from cold.
*slip* a shilling into his hand. the opportunity slipped away.
*improve* an invention. his health has improved.
*burn:* the soldiers burned everything that would burn (cf OE 16.0).

Other verbs of this category are *alter*, *bend*, *circulate*, *dash*, *diminish*, *embark*, *fade*, *form*, *freeze*, *gather*, *increase*, *issue*, *melt*, *separate*, *shake*, *start*, *thaw*, *twist*, *upset*.

**16.4₂.** Hence we have various synonymous expressions in the imperative. I quote from Washington Moon's *Ecclesiastical English*, p. 170, the following passages: *turn ye unto him* (Isaiah 36.6), *turn you*, at my reproof (Prov. 1.23), *turn thee* unto me (Ps 25.16), *turn thou* unto me (ib 69.16)—which with other similar examples are used in Progr. 242 = ChE 106 to illustrate case shiftings in the pronouns.

**16.43.** I give some examples of verbs which are not so often used intransitively:

Stevenson T 180 the fog was *collecting* rapidly | Wells N 66 something that did not join on to anything else in my life or *connect* with any of my thoughts | Brontë V 425 The week *consumed* | Gissing H 119 his pen *dipped* several times into the ink before he found himself able to write | McKenna M 81 But Deryk had *flung* away towards the dining-room | Kipl J 1.169 as soon as our eggs *hatch* | Doyle B 62 His dark brows *knitted* | Bennett C 2.210 her chin slightly *lifting* (often: the fog lifted, etc.) | Bennett RS 223 She held the ball of paper to the candle. It *lit* slowly, but it lit | Galsw IC 272 what was before him would not *materialise* (now beginning to be common, from US) | London M 127 the old excess of strength that seemed to *pour* from his body | Bunyan P 32 the rocks *rent*, the graves opened | Brontë J 258 the recollection *revived* | Beresford G 272 the illusion suddenly lifted and *scattered* | Walp C 425 Brandon took the letter and tore it into little pieces; they scattered upon the counterpane | id JP 519 But suppose things *smash* up | Jacobs L 52 the matches fell from his hand and *spilled* in the passage | Defoe R 63 everything that would *spoil*, either with rain or sun | ib 69 | Wells T M 19 it seems a pity to let the dinner spoil | Zangwill G 369 her voice was spoiling in the smoky atmosphere | Thack E 1.7 She stretched out her hand—indeed, when was it that that hand would not *stretch* out to do an act of kindness [N.B]. | Kingsley H 192 even if he *tired* of her | Shaw C 203 she began to tire of the subject | Ellis M 171 a man will tire of carrying a baby before a nurse-maid will (cf *weary* 16.51).

**16.44.** Sometimes one and the same verb is used in both ways by the same writer in close succession: By DJ 5.134 fire *flash'd* from Gulleyaz' eyes . . . her eyes flash'd always fire | Kaye Smith HA 281 Places can *change*, do change. Starvecrow had changed; he had changed it. While Stella, the woman, had not changed | McKenna SMa 310 I don't see where it's going to *stop* and I don't see who's

going to stop it | Chesterton F 122 The little car *shot* up to the right house like a bullet, and shot out its owner like a bomb shell | NP '21 the Speaker ordered Mr Irving to *withdraw* the expression or else withdraw from the House | Masefield C 139 'It'll *break* her heart'. 'Her heart won't break'.

**16.45.** I place here *lock*, *shut* and synonyms, the intransitive use of which may to some extent be due to the analogy of *open*, which it has been more convenient to place in a different section (16.53); some of the quotations might have been placed in 16.8 (note *will*, *would*): More U 130 thyes doores . . . wil *shutte* agayne by themselfes | Brontë V 284 most of the boxes did not *lock* | Di Sk 474 doors that would not *shut* | Di D 15 my eyes gradually *shut* up | Behn 345 the door fell to and *locked* | Hope F 45 you may go and sit on Kate's trunks till they *lock* | Stevenson B 139 doors were opening and *slamming* | Wells H 269 as though a door had *slammed* | Gissing H 271 drawers which would neither open nor *shut* | Defoe R 160 I could make it [the umbrella] to spread, but if it did not *let down* too, and *draw in*, it was not portable | Di D 139 a bureau . . . with a retreating top which opened, *let down*, and became a desk.

**16.46.** Here we have also *choke*, *stifle*, *suffocate*, originally transitive, used intransitively of the sensation; further *knock up* used in a similar way:

Di N 132 I shall *choke* | ib 733 he said in a choking voice | Caine E 141 she choked with joy, she choked with pain | Wells V 229 I shall *stifle* unless I can do something | ib 235 she felt she must *suffocate* if these men did not put her down | Benson J 65 You soon *knock up* if you don't take exercise [= get knocked up].

*Drown* is generally used in the transitive sense 'to kill by placing under water', but the participle *drowning* is often, and the other forms sometimes, found in the intransitive sense 'to die under water'' 'to get drowned':

BJo 3.168 the Thames being so near, where you may drown so handsomely | Merriman S 76 the face of a drown-

ing man | Hardy L 85 May I drown where he was drowned before I do it [N.B.] | Elizabeth R 47 to jump in and pull you out when you begin to drown | Sutton Vane Outw. 74 Women drown as easily as men.

**16.47.** It seems more natural to place the following verbs here than in one of the other classes: *dissolve* metals, dissolve Parliament | Sh R 2 V. 1.9 That you in pittie may dissolve to dew | London C 185 mighty coalitions will *shape* and *dissolve* in the swift whirl of events | to *drive* a carriage | Allen W 221 they drive in a victoria (cf. *ride* a horse, ride on horseback) | *push* one's bicycle | he pushed on; a pushing lad | to *upset* a glass | Thack N 131 the carriage must upset | to *wage* war | Hope O 78 fierce war waged between them | to *waste* time | Caine C 11 half her life had wasted away | to *work* a change | Di D 764 the change that gradually worked in me | Kipl L 162 a notion that will not work out.

*Convert* is obsolete in the intransitive use: Sh Lucr 691 This hot desire conuerts to colde disdaine | Irving (1826 NED) The infatuated world! It will not convert!

**16.48.** It is not clear how the originally transitive verbs *hold* and *obtain* came to be used intransitively in the meaning 'be valid': Spencer A 2.11 the law holds in the organic world (also *holds good*) | the rule obtains. A similar case is *apply*: we apply the rule to all living beings | the rule applies to all living beings. (To class 8? cf. also class 2).

**16.49.** In some respects the relation between the two uses of the verbs mentioned in this class resembles that between the active and the passive turn: *the stone rolls* is nearly the same thing as *the stone is rolled*, though in the former case the stone is thought of as somehow causing its own movement while in the latter case some other agent is more or less clearly present in the mind of speaker. Active and passive are found together in Austen E 176 presently the carriage *stopt*: she looked up; it *was stopt* by Mr. Weston | ib 197 it will be *breaking up* the party . . . the sooner every party *breaks up* the better | Goldsm V 1.203 riches will

*accumulate . . . accumulated* wealth | By DJ 16.118 Don Juan *shook*, as erst he *had been shaken.*

If on the other hand we start from the second use, the first may in most cases be said to be a causative or factitive: *to boil water* is *to make water boil, to cause water to boil.*

The following verbs are evidently from the first intransitive, and it is natural to look upon the transitive or causative use as derived: *fall*: Sh R2 III 4.104 Here did she fall a tear; obsolete, except, it seems, in Tasmania, where "a tree is falled, and the men who do it are called fallers" (Review of R June 1905. 637) | *fly:* Di D 191 Franklin used to fly a kite (very common) | *march:* Sh John III 1.246 to march a bloody hoast (now esp. *march off*) | *pass*, see 12. 51 and cf. Benson D 7 Conversation was a thing that made time pass, not a way of passing the time | *perish:* More U 133 no fyre can hurte or peryshe it (many later examples NED) | *rise* in various nautical expressions, see dicts. | *run, sail*, see 15.51 | *shrink:* Lamb E 1.54 the blast that nips and shrinks me | *spring:* I sprang my horse out of the road | Spect 166 a cock-pheasant that he had sprung in one of the woods | Defoe R 2.267 our ship had sprung a leak | Bennett W 1.260 she had sprung this indignity on him (12. 51) | *stumble*, causative esp. in the transferred sense 'puzzle, embarrass'; in the literal sense possibly in Sh John V. 5.18 the stumbling night | *walk:* Bennett W 2.239 he walked the horse to and fro | Ward E 125 Did we walk you too far this afternoon?

These verbs form the transition to class 7; cf also 12. 51.

## Verbs from Adjectives.

**16.51.** With regard to verbs derived from adjectives, OE in many cases made a distinction between causative verbs, derived originally by means of the ending *-jan*, whose *j* disappeared but left a trace in the mutated vowel, and intransitive verbs, formed with *-ojan*, whose *o* had disappeared before the literary period. Examples *cēlan* 'make

cool': *cōlian* 'become cool'. *lengan* 'make long': *langian* 'grow long; long for'. *wierman* 'keep warm': *wearmian* 'grow warm'.

It is generally the non-mutated form that has survived, and only very few of the mutated verbs are still in existence, such as *fill* from *full*, *bleach* (OE *blǣcan*) from OE *blāc*, ME *blake blok* 'shining, pale', *heal* from *whole* (OE *hāl*). Now no distinction is made between a causative and an intransitive form, either in the old verbs or in recent similar formations. (*Long* survives only in the derived intransitive meaning of 'desire'):

*cool* one's enthusiasm. the earth cools down.
*warm* an apartment. my heart warmed.
*heal* a wound. the wound healed slowly.
*clear* up a difficulty. the weather clears up.
*fit:* the tailor fitted the coat. the coat fitted.
*weary*: this wearied her. she wearied of their company.
*empty:* he emptied his pockets. Di T 2.288 the second tumbril empties and moves on.
*brighten:* she brightens the whole house. the prospect brightens.
*ripen:* the sun ripens the apples. apples ripen in the sun.

(The transitive and intransitive uses of the verbs in *-en* will be discussed in the Morphology).

**16.5₂.** Only a few quotations are needed here:

Sh Ven 548 gluttonlike she feeds, yet neuer *filleth* | Di N 242 his eyes filled with tears | Caine E 191 the air of the room seemed to fill with a sweet feminine presence | Sh Tro III 3.229 Those wounds *heale* ill, that men doe giue themselues.

**16.5₃.** *Open* may be placed here: he opened the door | the door opened, and a stranger entered | Mason R 221 the door was opening—very slowly, very stealthily, as though the hand which opened it feared to be detected | Caine C 211 the upper landing opened on to a salon | Di D 542 two or three public-rooms opened out of the stable-yard |

Wells V 130 as the realities of her position opened out before her.

Note the double use implied in Maugham PV 182 she hastened to open [tr.] such windows as would [sc. open, intr.].

**16.5₄.** We may here mention also a few Romanic verbs: *close* (the school closes, is closed) and *moderate*, generally tr., but intr. in Benson D 2.231 the wind had considerably moderated. *Corrupt*, generally with object, but Shelley 77 That heart which had grown old, but had corrupted not. Verbs in *-fy* are nearly always transitive, but *intensify* is occasionally used intransitively: Rose Macaulay O 257 a pain which deepened and intensified day by day.

## Verbs from Substantives.

**16.6₁.** A corresponding double-facedness is found in some verbs derived from substantives: *benefit* means both 'derive benefit' and 'procure benefit': *the community benefits by (from) this railway*, and *this railway benefits the community*. Both meanings are found in Sh. Cf also Wells Sleeper 26 evidently his sleep had benefited him.

Thus also *profit*: Sh H 6 B II 5.56 Ill blows the winde that profits no body | By 654 What can it profit thee? | he profited by the war.

**16.6₂.** *Board* means both 'take one's food at some place' and 'provide food': Di D 206 he could board somewhere else . . . two or three houses where he thought he could be boarded [N.B.]. Similarly *lodge*: Goldsm V 2.101 to procure a room or two to lodge the family in | Jerome T 54 You'll lodge with a Mrs. P. She'll board you and lodge you [N.B.]— and *feed*: he feeds ravenously four times a day | to feed the horses; cf above 12. 5₅.

*Delight* = 'give delight', and 'take delight': Sh Hml II 2.323 man delights not me . . . if you delight not in man [N.B.] | Carlyle R 1.11 he delighted to hear of all things | I shall be delighted to hear from you.

*Colour:* Di N 535 he quite coloured, a memorable cir-

cumstance, young men not being remarkable for modesty . . if they colour at all, it is rather their practice to colour the story, and not themselves [N.B.].

*Button*, generally trans. (button your coat!), but Walp Cp 432 an old dirty blue suit with a coat that buttoned over the waistcoat like a seaman's jacket. (Cp 16.81).

Note further *count*: I count my buttons | this counts for nothing; —and the following quotations for rarer uses: Sheridan 298 the morning-gun is going to *fire*. Cannon fires | Bennett W 1.200 How is that Mrs Gilchrist *shaping* as a nurse? | Walker L 411 Browning *contrasts* with Tennyson also in his remarkable independence | Di T 2.249 the hour had *measured* like most other hours.

The verb *fear* had formerly the meaning 'produce fear in, frighten, deter', e. g. Roister 61 (where immediately after it is used in its modern meaning) | Sh Shr I 2.211 Tush, tush, feare boyes with bugs. For he feares none [N.B.] | More U 233 they do not only feare theire people from doinge euell (deterrent a flagitiis). Hence *feare me* = mod. *fear;* frequent in Sh, etc.; cp Marl J 876 with 1110.

*Strengthen:* Times 17. May 1902: as the old proverb warns us, the cold strengthens as the day lengthens. It does strengthen in an intransitive sense, but assuredly not in a transitive. On the contrary, it weakens, it depresses, it irritates . . . [N.B.].

Here we may place some verbs in *-ate*: *graduate* is in the same sense used actively in England and passively in America: he graduated at Oxford in '94 | he was graduated from Harvard in '94 | Medwin S 43 after Shelley had been *matriculated* | he matriculated at Trinity in '98 | Galsw WM 182 Soames had *concentrated* | Bennett C 1.200 property in the centre of the town *depreciated.*

Cp finally Merrick C 9 the plans they made, which never *fructified* (see on *-fy* 16.54).

## Causatives and Inchoatives.

**16.71.** The old causatives (formed with *-jan* from the preterit stem, which was later mutated) have mostly dis-

appeared. Of the old pairs we have now only two left comparatively intact, namely *sit* (OE *sittan*)—*set* (OE *settan*) and *lie* (OE *licgan*)—*lay* (OE *lecgan*), and even here we shall presently see some disturbances of the old distinction. As a third pair might be added *rise* (OE *rīsan*)—*rear* (OE *rǣran*), but these are no longer felt to be connected with each other, and the Scandinavian *raise* will now more than *rear* be felt as the causative belonging to *rise*. In the modern period the practice has become more and more usual of using an intransitive verb unchanged in a causative sense.

**16.7₂.** To express the *beginning* of sitting (as an 'inchoative verb'), or the preparatory movements leading to that position, the old phrase was *I set me* (*down*) (Sh LL IV 3.4 set thee downe); but this is rare in ModE, as the connexion of *sit* and *set* is somewhat loosened (see below 16.7₅) and we get instead (1) *I sit me* [orig. dative] (*down*), (2) *I sit myself* (*down*), where *myself* is hardly to be taken as the object, though its position before *down* would tend to show this to have been the actual feeling, and (3) *I sit down*, which has now become the regular phrase. In the first quotation we have three different expressions, the last being now antiquated.

(1) Bacon A 10.30 he satt him down . . . we . . . sate down with him. And when we were sett (cf ib 14.21 after we were set againe, = 'had sat down, were seated', also 26.30 and 34.6) | More U 114 we sate vs downe vpon the same benche | Sh Hml V. 2.31 I sate me downe | Sh Mids IV 1.1 sit thee downe vpon this flowry bed | Defoe R 36, 52 I sat me down | Keats 2.150 I felt . . . And sat me down | Di Do 344 sitting him down (also Di N 697, not in solemn style) | Kipl B 179 the sons of Adam sit them down [archaic] | Galsw F 313 on the wall he sat him down.

(2) Defoe M 36 . . . says he, and so sits himself down in a chair | Lamb R 66 she sat herself down | Kingsley H 121 there he sat himself down under the garden wall | Di N 86 he sat himself down to wait [the regular phrase in Dickens] Jerome T 14 Tommy, said Peter, as he sat himself down to breakfast | Herrick M 12 I sat myself down.

(3) More U 29 we satte downe | Lyly C 284 hee sate downe | Sh Err III 1.33 sit downe at the hatch | Bunyan P 44 he sat down to rest him | Defoe M 130 I sat me down . . . and then sat down [N.B.] | Di N 464, 494, 637 Sit down | ib 744 Ralph sat down [seems rare in Dickens outside of the imperative].

We have thus in the imperative three synonymous expressions in Sh: H 4 B IV 5.182 *sit thou* by my bedde, Mids IV 1.1 *sit thee* downe vpon this flowry bed (*thee* according to 16.21 and 14.4), LL IV 3.4 *set thee* downe.

In Sh H6C IV.3.2 *The King by this is set him downe to sleepe*, we undoubtedly have a blending of *has set him* and *is set*. Thus already Ch C 663 [they] were set hem in a taverne.

**16.73** We have corresponding expressions with *lie* (OE *licgan*); only here the combinations with the old causative *lay* (OE *lecgan*) are more frequent than those with *set*, and *I lie me down* is comparatively rare:

(1) Sh H6C II 3.2 I lay [present tense] me downe a little while to breath | Mi PL 10.777 how glad would [I] lay me down As in my mothers lap | Defoe R 2.202 I laid me down | Swift J 82 I will lay me down to sleep | Di N 386 repletion and starvation laid them down together | ib 657 they laid them down at night [in rather solemn style] | Boswell 1.151 Johnson laid himself down at his ease upon one of the tombstones | Scott Iv 181 they laid themselves down.

(2) Mi Passion 21 [he] Then lies him meekly down fast by his brethrens side | Mi L'All 110 | Di N 722 [solemnly] he had lain him down to die.

(3) Sh As II 6.2 I can go no further. Heere lie I downe | Bunyan P 37 they lay down to sleep | Swift 3.284 I lay down behind a thicket (pt.).

**16.74.** Even apart from what has already been said, we have to some extent a confusion between the intransitive verbs *lie*, *sit* and the causatives *lay*, *set*.

*Lie* used transitively = *lay*. See NED *lie* 15 with examples from 1387 to 1880, which are, however, not quite

homogeneous. In most of the recent examples we have the ptc. *lain* used instead of *laid*, which may be considered a new (strong) formation from *lay* and need not imply that the same authors would be capable of saying *lie* instead of *lay*.

*Lay* used intransitively = *lie*, NED: "an illiterate substitute for *lie*, its identity of form with the past tense of the latter no doubt accounting largely for the confusion". Examples: Byron [illiterate!] Ch H 4.180 there let him lay [rime: spray, bay] | Di D 118 (vg) he lays in five and twenty foot of ground | Di Do 282 other subjects began to lay heavily on the captain's mind. Now considered vg.

Other examples (from Waller, Marvell, Pope, Thomson, Sterne, etc.) in Flügel's Dict. and in Lounsbury SU 138ff.

One reason of the confusion is the almost identical sounds of *lay down* and *laid down*; this accounts for Defoe R 2.1991 lay'd down again | Brontë W 35 they had never laid down, though it was past midnight | Haggard S 108 not forgetting before I laid down to thank Providence— and this in connexion with the other causes of confusion leads to O Henry RS 9 the fault laid with the people | Wyllarde Crooked Man 154 she missed the more subtle meaning which underlaid them [the words].

In other cases, the intransitive use of *lay* may be due to the omission of an object easily understood from the context (cf 16.1₂), as when *to lay for* means 'to set an ambush for, waylay', and *to lay on* 'to attack, beat vigorously'. This is especially the case in some nautical phrases, where *lay* (at anchor, out) is constantly used though grammarians insist on *lie* as the 'correct' word, cf Poe S 63 Lying-to, or, in sea-parlance, "laying-to".

**16.7₅.** The intransitive use of *set*, as in *the sun sets*, may have arisen from an earlier reflexive use. Cp also: the sea sets to the North West | to set out for a journey (Swift 3.281 the author sets out as captain of a ship) | to set forth (Sh in the same sense) | the evening sets in | to set to work: Shaw 2.12 He sits down and sets to work | ib 88 Come and set about your work.

In *set up* (= 'settle in business' on one's own account) the object (*business*, etc.) is omitted, cf 16.1₂. Examples: Seeley E 151 the natural law which prompts every colony, when it is ripe, to set up for itself | Shaw 1.164 I shall set up in chambers in the City. In a different sense: Kingsley Y 25 they set up for critics | Shaw Ms 163 God forbid that I should set up to be a judge.

*Sit* = 'make to sit' has been gaining ground because the old causative *set* has come to mean more indefinitely 'put, place', not merely in a sitting posture, as seen in Stevenson T 228 they had *set* me with my back against the wall; and I *stood* there, looking Silver in the face.—Examples of *sit* in the causative sense:

Di Do 91 taking Paul in his arms, and sitting him on another little table | ib 307 (vg) you have sat me by your fire | Doyle S 5.275 Just sit me up a little.

A second transitive *sit* is used with *horse* as object = 'keep the seat on, ride (well, etc.)'. (Qy: is *a* in *sit a horse* from *on*?). Cf Sh H8 IV 2.16 he grew so ill He could not sit his mule | Field T 3.69 she had sat her horse during the last five or six miles | Thack N 269 The colonel sits a horse uncommonly well | Swinb L 97 I wish I could sit a horse half as well.

A third transitive use of *sit* is seen in Mered E 186 I will undertake to sit you through it [the wine] up to morning. — The candidate will not be allowed to sit the examination [go in for].

**16.7₆.** Note that no separate causative exists corresponding to the third verb *stand* (OE *standan*), and that *stand up* is used, like *sit down* and *lie down*, to express the beginning of standing (= 'rise to one's feet'), besides being used for being in the condition itself (= 'be standing').

*Stand* is used transitively in various senses. First, 'to make some one stand, place him (in a standing position)'; not found before the 19th c. Di Do 9 a boy, whom he stood down on the floor | id D 168 he stood his pipe on its head against the door-post | Haggard S 165 he stood it [my dressing-case] on the foot of the couch | Jerome T 133 with

a sudden jerk, he stood him beside his sister under the gas-jet | Zangwill G 318 to be stood in a row of brothers and sisters | he was stood (up) against the wall and shot.

Second, *stand* means 'resist, endure, go through, bear'; examples of this and related significations (which, in a way, may be compared to the use of *run* in *run a risk*):

Sh Cy V 3.60 Who dares not stand his foe [in this construction, with the opponent as object, it dates from ME, but is now antiquated] | Sh Tp IV 1.7 thou Hast strangely stood the test | Scott Iv 123 the yeoman stood the angry glance of the prince with . . . steadiness | Troll W 228 he stood his ground manfully | id B 264 he had gone to the battle-field, stood the dust and heat of the day | I stood as good a chance as any man. Cf 13.2₇.

A third transitive sense is 'to cost' (it stands him four shillings; antiquated), which leads to the meaning 'give [a treat]', as in Hughes T2.127 What are you going to stand? Stand! Nothing, unless you like a cup of cold tea | Benson D 247 the founder of the feast, who stands us champagne (cf passive 15.3₁, 15.4₂).

**16.7₇.** We seem to have a parallel case when *stay* is used causatively; both uses are found together in Sh As I 3.69 we *staid* her for your sake [= made her stay here] . . . I did not then intreat to haue her *stay*. (Cf also Sh Cæs V 5.44 stay thou = H6C III 2.58 stay thee, cf Progr in L § 188 = Ch on E § 86f.) But this verb (in NED derived from OF *estai-* < Lat. *stare*) has to a considerable degree been confused with the old transitive *stay* (OF *estayer*, F *etayer*) 'prop up'. Besides, the construction of *stay* may have been influenced by *stop*. We have another causative use in the phrase *to stay* the stomach 'to satisfy hunger (provisionally)'; with regard to *stay dinner* see above 12.6₆.

**16.7₈.** *Hang*: in OE the strong verb *hōn*, *heng*, *hangen* was transitive, and the weak *hangian*, *hangode*, *hangod* was intransitive (thus the inverse relation of ON *hanga* strong intr., *hengja* weak tr.), but as in Scand. and German the two were early confused and now *hang*, *hung*, *hung* is both tr.

and intr.; in the sense 'put to death by hanging' the form of the ptc. recommended by grammarians and most often used is the weak *hanged* (thus always in the North),but the form *hung* is not at all rare and seems to be gaining ground, the form *hanged* being, however, always used in the imprecation 'I'll be hanged if I do it'. Cf also 12.5₄.

As already remarked, *sink* to some extent combines OE *sincan* (strongly inflected, intransitive) and *sencan* (weak verb, causative); the *e* of the latter may have been raised to *i* as in *link*, OE *hlence*, etc (I 3.113). But the pret. *sunk* originally belonged to the intr. verb. Examples of the causative use: Bunyan G 33 These things did sink me into very deep despair | Spect 17 Two or three noisy country squires . . . had considerably sunk the price of house-rent | ib 189 it sinks the virtue of a nation | Austen M 28 to sink her in sad mortification | Austen P 135 it will not sink me in your esteem.

**16.7₉.** Other intransitive verbs used causatively are:

*dine* (= give dinner to; not infrequent): Mal 728 who someuer *dyned* or *feested* syre Gawayne | Beaconsf L 233 the Duke enquired of Lothair how many he could dine in his hall. 'We must dine more than two hundred on Monday' | Thack P 1.15 They dined each other round in the moonlight nights | Mered H 109 I dined you that day. Thus also *lunch*: Wells Am 194 we dined him, we lunched him,— and (rare) *sup*: Walton A 64 more fish then [=than] wil sup my self and friend. Thus also *subsist*: Defoe M 128 he could not have subsisted me there (many quotations NED). —Cp *eat*, *graze*, above 12.5₃; and *sleep* in US.: a sleeping car sleeps thirty passengers (Mencken AL 34).

*doze*: Defoe R 110 the tobacco had doz'd my head | 111 I doz'd myself with it [the medicine]—not in use now.

*grow:* grow corn, oldest example NED 1774; grow a beard: Smedley F 2.143 he has grown a great pair of moustaches (common).

*learn* B Jo A 5.235 Your Fly will learne you all games. This use of *learn* = 'teach' is still very frequent in vulgar speech.

*ring:* Thack V 58 the great dinner bell was rung . . . the great dinner bell rang [N.B.].

*starve* orig. intr., from 16th c. also 'cause to perish (with hunger)'. Troll W 251 that Mr. Harding, if left to himself, would certainly starve . . . not that he would be starved as regarded dress coats, port wine, and pocket-money, but that he would positively perish of inanition [N.B.] | starve out a city.

*stick* (intr. in: these words stick to the memory | we must stick together): stick no bills; cf 13.65.

*sweat:* sweat working-people | sweated labour, articles | Childers R 139 Steady on! Don't sweat yourself.

*work:* Bennett W 2.164 employing two servants, working then very hard at low wages.

Compare above class 4, and on the whole 12.5 on the causative meaning of verbs that may take objects in a different sense. *Speed* the parting guest (Pope, etc.), not really 'send with speed', but from the greeting *God speed you.*

## Activo-passive Use of some Verbs.

"The book sells well".

**16.81.** Before discussing this phenomenon we shall give a series of quotations in which it is found, arranged alphabetically according to the verb used in this way.

Trelawny R 19 my plays won't *act* . . . my poesy won't sell | Di D 564 the figures made her cry. They would not *add* up | McCarthy 2.409 all these figures add up quite correctly | Goldsm V 1.101 Description would but *beggar* (nonce-use of the Shakespearean phrase, not in NED) | Kipl L 137 this filthy fluff will never *brush* off my bags | the mud will brush off when it is dry | Sheridan 322 if it [the coat] had been tighter, 't would neither have *hooked* nor *buttoned* | Fulgens 78 And therin I may well with hym *compare* | Marl F 1024 none . . . can compare with thee for the rare effects of magicke | Archer A 90 New York does not for a moment compare with Chicago | Kaye Smith GA

the meat *cooks* all the better if you cook it slow | Alabaster *cuts* very smooth and easy | Thack (NED) The old banker died . . . and 'cut up' prodigiously well (18.29) | Bennett R 16 the ham was not *digesting* very well | Farquhar B 369 three or four swords . . . but they won't *draw* | Burns 1.280 reaming swats ['ale'], that *drank* divinely | Sh Alls I 1.176 one of our French wither'd peares, it lookes ill, it *eates* drily | Goldsm V 1.158 if the cakes at tea eat [prt.] short and crisp, they were made by Olivia | Tenn (quoted Dyboski): cut out the rotten from your apple, your apple eats the better.

It *feels* cold indoors (cf 16.23) | Mered H 398 the words would not *form* on her lips | Walp Cp 189 the long pauses that seemed to be always forming between them | Archer A 89 the middle storeys do not *let* | Kaye Smith T 159 We might put up two or three [big houses] and see how they let | Lewis MS 209 That doesn't *listen* so bad. Sounds racy [U.S., rare] | Defoe Rox 13 if I had anything that would sell or *pawn* for a little money | Wells V 71 four babies, none of whom *photographed* well | Quincey 173 the old gentleman's speech *reads* excellently | Ru C 99 Quite serious all this, though it reads like jest | Wister Grant 21 his letters read stark and bald as time-tables | GalswTL 105 a poem so full of feeling that it would not *rhyme* | Merriman S 14 the dirt *rubs* off [i. e. easily] | Sh Tro I 3.360 Let vs . . . shew our fowlest wares, And thinke perchance they'l *sell* | Swift J 160 I hear they [books] sell mightily | Goldsm V 1.119 the silver rims alone will sell for double the money | Thack N 310 I guess all the pictures he'll paint won't sell for much | Mackenzie PR 47 a large Upman [cigar] that would *smoke* for a good hour | Shaw D 19 To make them [bacilli] visible you must stain them. Well, do what you will, some of them wont *stain* | Mc Kenna SS 154 when the matches refused to *strike* | Benson J 133 he tried to tear the programme up. But it seemed to be made of a thin sheet of some hard substance and it would not *tear* | Shaw 2.113 she pulls the letter out of the machine so crossly that it tears | Austen E 170 the story *told* well | Wells M 48

Neither does acquired constitutional ill-health necessarily *transmit* to a child | the book would not *translate* well | Ward E 484 one *transplants* badly at sixty-six | Brontë V 365 It is only cotton, and *washes* better than any other colour | Shaw St J 16 an explanation . . . will not wash | Wells H 257 these assumptions had had such an air of being trustworthy, as being certain to wash and *wear*! | Barrie MO 133 I am at a sentence that will not *write*.

**16.8₂.** *Wear* must be specially mentioned on account of its ambiguity. "*A dress that is much worn*" may mean either a style of dress that is fashionable, or an individual garment that is the worse for wear. When the verb is used intransitively, it may even have quite contradictory senses. We may say *I want a cloth that will wear*, and *I want a cloth that will not wear*, the two statements meaning exactly the same thing". (Bradley, ME 188).

Quotations: Sh Sonn 77.1 Thy glasse will shew thee how thy beauties were [i. e. wear, cp waste in next line] | Swift 3.303 my cloaths and shoes would soon wear out | Goldsm V 1.1 such qualities as would wear well | Di D 775 he was tolerably stricken in years, but being a mild, meek, calm little man, had worn so easily | GE A 234 near-sighted eyes always wear the best | Doyle S 1.130 Some letters of a typewriter get more worn than others, and some wear only on one side | Bennett W 2.323 overcoats that would not wear out | Wells B 297 he had not worn so well . . . neither physically nor mentally do soldiers wear so well as lawyers.

**16.8₃.** How are we to account for this phenomenon? Sweet NEG § 249 calls such verbs *passival* and says that "their grammatical subject is logically their direct object . . . the subject not being expressed because of its indefiniteness", but this evidently is neither a good description nor an explanation of the phenomenon: how is it that here subject and object seem confused, while it is utterly impossible to say, e. g. *his words believe* meaning 'they believe his words', no matter how indefinite the subject is? Nor is

there any occasion to create a new term passival verbs: our concern is not with a special class of verbs (as the one comprising *change*, etc.), but with a special use of a great many verbs under special conditions.

The peculiarity of this use consists in the passive meaning to be attributed here to the active verb, which is thus notionally passive though formally active (Readers who may have scruples at these terms may be pacified by reading PG 165). Now this *activo-passive* use of some verbs is only the last link of the long chain of phenomena considered in this chapter, by which active forms have often come to mean nearly the same things as passives of the same verbs.

He dresses elegantly: he is dressed elegantly.
He married: he was married.
His shirt dried in the sun: his shirt was dried in the sun.
The room filled rapidly: the room was filled rapidly.
The subject dropped: the subject was dropped.
They starved: they were starved.
The war began in Belgium: the war was begun in Belgium.
The train stopped: the train was stopped.
My hat blew off: my hat was blown off.
The stone rolled on: the stone was rolled on.
He stood: he was stood against the wall and shot.

**16.84.** This doublesidedness is caused in *dress*, etc., by the possibility of leaving out the reflexive pronoun, in *dry* and *fill* by the fact that there is no distinction (or no longer any distinction) between transitive and intransitive derivatives from adjectives, and in verbs like *begin*, *end*, *move*, *roll*, etc. by the natural intrinsic meaning of the verbs themselves. Now this doublesidedness has been extended to *sell* and other verbs, where it is not so natural to the meaning of the verb itself as in the case of *change* or *end*; consequently there are certain restrictions: it is not possible to say, for instance, "this house sold yesterday" for "was sold". When we say "his novels sell very well", we think to some extent of the books as active themselves, as the cause of the extensive sale, while we are not thinking so

much of the activity of the bookseller. The sentence therefore is descriptive of something that is felt as characteristic of the subject, and therefore the verb generally requires some descriptive adjective or adverb: the meat *cuts tender*, this scientific paper *reads like a novel.* Very often the pseudo-activity of the subject is shown by the use of the verb *will*, especially in the negative form: the figures *will not add*, the suit-case *would not lock* (the matches *refused to strike*). Both these traits are abundantly shown in our quotations and must be taken into account if we want to understand our phenomenon rightly.

**16.8₅.** Through the implied pseudo-activity of the subject this use of the verbs has some points of resemblance to the French use of the reflexive as distinct from the regular passive: *shows* corresponds to *se montre* rather than to *est montré*, and we are reminded of the disinclination in English to use the reflexive turn because of the clumsiness of the *self*-forms. Similarly in German: Muret's Wörterb. translates *read* sich lesen (lassen); *it reads like a fact* es liest sich, als wäre es wahr; *this book reads well* dieses buch liest sich gut.

**16.8₆.** A concomitant cause of the use of the active form in a more or less passive sense may have been the doublesidedness of the form in *-ing*. This, like other verbal substantives (nexus-substantives) is indifferent to the distinction between active and passive and may therefore be sometimes understood actively and sometimes passively (as in Austen E 40 Harriet only wanted *drawing out* [pass.], and *receiving* [act.] a few hints | Brontë W 234 she deserved *punishing* for *punishing* me | NP '13 Life is made hell by *the breaking up* [act.] of old standards and *the breaking down* [pass.] of new). As will be said elsewhere, this resulted in the use of the expanded tenses in a passive sense: the house *is building* [is a-building] | what *is doing?* etc. Now this use of sentences like *the book is selling well* may have assisted in making people say *the books sells well.* In the following quotations it is more or less doubtful whether we have the passive meaning of the form in *-ing* from a transitive verb,

or an active participle of an intransitive verb: Di N 291 some articles which were *airing* on the fender | also ib 435 | Herrick M 198 there was trouble *brewing* | Di N 629 this seems to have been a long time *brooding* | while the rice was cooking [NED] | Di N 225 as if he were some extraordinary wild animal then *exhibiting* for the first time | Austen M 116 the baize . . . was actually *forming* into a curtain by the housemaids [passive, cf *by*] Conway C 59 a resolution was forming in my mind | Stevenson T 177 to envy the doctor, walking in the cool shadow . . . while I sat *grilling* | *missing* (16.93) | Tenn L 1.250 The presses have been *modelling*, and the men *educating* up till now | Thack N 166 the shutters were just *opening* to let in the day | Di N 621 This game was constantly *playing* | Fielding 3.582 without waiting for the broadside which was *preparing* for us | Franklin 177 while these were preparing | Austen M 385 there was a rich amends preparing for her | Di N 201 some court-dresses which had been a long time preparing | Di Ch 52 the old year's effects were *selling* cheap | Field 3.530 while matters were thus *settling* between the old folks | Di N 578 I might have a nice little bit of hot roast meat *spoiling* at home all this time | *wanting*, 16.92.

A special interest attaches to those sentences in which we find both participles used together to express a contrast not really of passive and active, but of past and present time: Fox 1.242 all England is *changed or changing* | Spencer A 2.128 wherever wood is *formed or forming*.

## Supplementary Remarks.

**16.91.** I may mention here some verbs which in some combinations have the same, or nearly the same, meaning in the active and passive: I *determined* to go | I was determined to go | Defoe Rox 202 I *resolved* not only to let her go, but was resolved to go with her myself | we *agreed* to go | we were agreed to go | he *possessed* great wealth | he was possessed of great wealth (12.51); cp also *seized.* | *I oppose* this measure | I am opposed to this measure.

**16.9₂.** It is different with *want* and *lack*, where the same form may be notionally active and passive: these verbs belong to the class mentioned in 11.2, in which a (preposed) object in course of time has become the subject. The original meaning 'not to exist, to be deficient' is seen with an object (orig. dative) in AR 194 Hwonne ou ['you'] ne wonteð nowiht | 274 hwat þe wonteð of holinesse | 398 no wunne ne schal wonten þe. The shifted construction with nom. is seen in Bale Three L 114 Thu shalt want no grace; and this is the usual construction nowadays; also with *for* 13.2₃.

But when no person is indicated, the original meaning is still living, especially in sentences introduced with *there*: AR 344 o word ne schal þer wonten | Marl E 1663 right makes roome, Where weapons want | Sh LL IV 3.237 where nothing wants | Shr III 2.250 though bride and bridegroom wants For to supply the places at the table, You know there wants no junkets at the feast | Galsw SS 251 Only the Judge wanted now to complete the pattern | Sterne 95 there seemed to want a sixth sense to do it rightly | Browning 128 there wants a carriage, money and the rest | Caine M 235 it wanted all his resolution not to take her in his arms | McKenna SS 84 there wanted no new colleges breaking through its immemorial sides | Lawrence L 97 There wants a man about the place.—In the first four quotations, the expanded form *be wanting*, *are wanting*, *is wanting* would now be used: for the expanded *is wanting* has the same original meaning (notionally passive), see e. g. Spect 113 bringing into their country whatever is wanting | Defoe R 159 they [breeches] were rather wanting to keep me cool than to keep me warm | Austen M 379 the early habit of reading was wanting | Macaulay E 4.247 asperity was an ingredient seldom wanting in the writings of Francis. But *is wanting in* is notionally active and means 'has not', see 13.2₃.

**16.9₃.** The constructions of *lack* are nearly parallel to those of *want*. The old one with a dative is seen in Ch A 756 of manhood him lakkede right naught (also F 16); the new

one in Ch G 672 we lakken our conclusion (in Ellsm MS with *of*) | Roister 73 what lacke we now? | Redford W 90 | Bale Three L 623 He lacketh nothynge (ib 1480) | More U 232, 253 | Sh Cor II 2.86 I shall lacke voyce etc. *Lack for*, see 13.23; ib on *is lacking in* in an active sense. But without *in* the meaning of *is lacking* is passive.

**16.94.** *Miss* is and has been used in a great many significations, which this is not the place to record. The construction with the person in the dative is rarer than with the two preceding verbs; NED quotes among others Ch T III 445 of that [= what] him missed. Here we shall give only a few quotations for the passive meaning of *is missing*: Bunyan P 169 had his jewels been missing | Goldsm 661 they are missing, and not to be found . . . she has missed them already | Quincey 5 some parts of the unpublished sections are missing. Thus also as an adjunct: the missing link | Mered R 20 search for the missing boy.

**16.95.** *Need* beside the active meaning (he needs money) has the passive meaning in Lyly C 290 It shall not neede ('be necessary') | Mi SA 1554 No preface needs | Carlyle FR 93 there need no axes. Cp also Sh Lr I 2.32 what needed then that terrible dispatch? (But ib 35 I shall not neede spectacles).

On the analogy of these *require* is sometimes used in a passive sense: Troll B 239 It does not require that a woman should be in love to be irritated at this | Spencer Ed 4 If there requires further evidence (unusual).

**16.96.** It may not be superfluous at the end of this chapter to remark once more that the relations between subject and object, between active and passive meanings of the same verbs, as well as the shiftings dealt with in 11.2—11.7 can only be understood when we realize that subject and object in their relation to the verb of the sentence stand nearly on the same footing: both are "primaries". It may seem strange that in the linguistic order of rank a word belonging to the highest rank, a primary, yet is "governed" (as the usual phrase is) as an object by the verb, which

is admittedly of a lower rank, a secondary; but that is really less strange than the fact that a primary may be "governed" by a tertiary, namely a preposition in groups like *in the room.* Such things serve to remind us that the use of such words as "govern", and, for the matter of that, "rank", in speaking of the relations of words and ideas is only, and can only be, figurative and should not, therefore, be taken too literally.

---

## Chapter XVII.

## Predicatives.

**17.01.** Predicatives naturally fall into two groups, *predicatives of being* and *predicatives of becoming.* The distinction is analogous to that between an ordinary object and an object of result (above 12.1 and 2), and when we come to deal with nexus-objects, we shall see a corresponding division. Some verbs may be used in two meanings with both kinds of predicatives, e. g. *go*; this is especially important with regard to the combination of *be* and a passive participle (18.3). We shall take the predicatives of being first.

If learned names are preferred, the two classes may be termed *static* and *kinetic.* Cp my remarks PG 287 on 'Aspect'. In Finnish, predicatives of being are put in the nominative if a permanent state is implied *(isäni on kipeä* 'my father is ill, i. e. an invalid'), and in the essive if a transitory state is implied *(isäni on kipeänä* 'my father is ill', i. e. just now); but *become*-predicatives are put in the translative *(isäni on jo tullut kipeäksi* 'my father has become ill'). The original meaning of the translative seems to have been motion to, and the use may thus be compared with the use of *zu* in G. *zu etwas werden, til* in Dan. *blive til noget.*

**17.02.** Sometimes the infinitive *to be* may be inserted before a predicative without materially modifying the signification: it *seems* (*to be*) superfluous | this *appears* (*to be*) true | he *proved* (*to be*) a rascal | Thack N 49 my intimacy with them *grew to be* considerable | McCarthy 2.431 public executions had long grown to be a scandal to the country.—

Curme CG 112 contrasts *He was found to be sleeping* (fact) and *He was found sleeping* (with descriptive force).

## Predicatives of Being.

**17.11.** The phenomena to be dealt with here may be arranged in something like the following gradation:

There he sat, *a giant among dwarfs.*
He came back *a changed being altogether.*
He married *young* and died *poor.*
The snow was falling *thick.*
The natives go *naked.*
The street ran *parallel* with the beach.
She stood *godmother* to his little boy.
He seemed *anxious.*
It proved *true.*
It was *true.*
*The more fool* he!

In the first sentence we have a description added to the main sentence in *extraposition*; then come some instances of *quasi-predicatives*, which lead up to real *predicatives*: these are found first with verbs which have a full meaning of their own, then with *be*, which is practically devoid of meaning and only serves to connect subject and predicative, and is therefore called a *link-verb* or *copula*; finally, in the last sentence, there is not even a link between the two elements. Even in this short survey we see, what will appear more clearly from many examples below, that some verbs when connected with predicatives tend to lose their full meaning and approach the function of an empty link: it is generally believed that the same development has taken place with the verb *be* itself, which is supposed to have meant 'grow' in prehistoric times (cf Gr *phuō*); the original meaning of **wes-* (found in the forms *was*, *were*) may have been 'live, stay', but no one knows what was the original meaning of the third root connected with these two to form a paradigm, that found in *am* (orig. **es-mi*).

## Extraposition.

**17.12.** Words in extraposition may be added as a kind of after-thought after the sentence has been completed; they stand outside it and form, as it were, a separate utterance, which might even be called a separate sentence (cf PG 306ff.) The intonation of the whole group is generally the same as if we had two independent sentences: falling tone in *sat* (There he sat), as if nothing more were to follow. In writing it is usual to have a comma before the words in extraposition, but sometimes a full stop is preferred to mark the break in thought (There he sat. A giant among dwarfs!), and not infrequently we find a dash: Shelley 584 "Mont Blanc appears,—still, snowy, and serene". In the following passage modern editions insert a comma, which the old editions have not, after *stand*: Sh Lr III 2.19 Heere I stand your slaue, A poore, infirme, weake, and dispis'd old man. This shows the transition to quasi-predicatives, for if *I stand your slave* be spoken without any break, *slave* occupies approximately the same position as the quasi-predicatives after the same verb mentioned in 17.27.

Where I speak of extraposition, most scholars would speak of *apposition*. There is, however, a distinction between the phenomenon here dealt with and such cases of apposition as "Thomas Brown, the eldest son of a wealthy merchant, was born in 1820", where the appositional words are placed in the middle of the sentence. Of course, there are cases in which apposition and extraposition are hardly distinguishable, e. g. "I discovered Mont Blanc, that giant among mountains". I should speak of apposition in Coleridge's "A sadder and a wiser man He rose the morrow morn". — A special case of extraposition is found when the additional words explain what was meant by a provisionally used pronoun, e. g. "He is a clever boy, that Tom Smith" (cp "He is a clever boy, is Tom") or "It was a pity that she should hear it".

The easy transition from extraposition to quasi-predicative is seen in two sentences from the same novel, one with a comma, the other without one: Mason R 282 In the east the day was breaking, pale and desolate | ib 276 The morning had broken clear, the day was sunny and cloudless.

## Quasi-Predicatives.

**17.2₁.** We next come to quasi-predicatives. What is characteristic of the combinations treated in the following sections is that they admit of a circumscription in which the substantive or adjective appears as the predicative of a form of the verb *be*: *we parted the best of friends* = we were the best of friends when we parted | *they go naked* = they are naked as they go (about) | *he lay sick* = he was sick, and he was lying | *he died a beggar* = he died while he was a beggar, or, he was a beggar when he died. The same analysis cannot be applied to clear cases of predicatives like *he looked young* | *he seemed happy* | *he remained silent*, though of course there are transitions between the two groups.

In sentences with quasi-predicatives the nexus is wholly or nearly complete without the quasi-predicative; in sentences with real predicatives it is not; and in the sentences containing the verb *be* the real nexus is between the subject and the predicative, as *be* is a negligible factor from the notional point of view.

**17.2₂.** Verbs of motion are frequently combined with quasi-predicatives (which are in the ordinary grammatical terminology said to be in apposition to the subject). In many sentences *as*, which is the typical particle (preposition) of predicatives, might be inserted before substantives:

Sh Hml IV 5.78 When sorrowes come, they *come* not *single spies*, But in battalions | Marl F 265 Goe and *returne an old Franciscan frier* | Burns 1.158 They *gang in stirks* [i. e. young bullocks], and *come out asses* | Austen M 297 the gentlemen *parted the best of friends* (similarly Di Do 120, Aumonier OB 293, Troll B 318, but ib 324 to part as enemies) | Mitford OV 96 in which rencontre the gander *came off conqueror* | Galsw IC 55 Would she *come out a swan?* | Locke FS 237 She had *left* them *a merry, kittenish child.* She had *returned a woman, slender* . . . | id GP 149 For the next few days he *went about the picture of ferocious gloom.*—Cp also Rose Macaulay P 5 Johnny might *end a cabinet minister.*

*Go* may be used with a substantive (without the indefinite article) to denote the way in which one gets a passage: Defoe R 2.14 to go *passenger* to the East Indies | Thack P 2.316 [I] went *cabin-boy* on board an Indiaman.

**17.2₃.** When adjectives are used as quasi-predicatives, it would be impossible to use *as* before them.

*Go* has to some extent retained its meaning 'to move about' in combinations which serve to indicate the way in which one is clothed (or not clothed): Mandv 178 men and women gon alle *naked* . . . goynge clothed | Sh Lr II 4.271 If onely to go *warme* were gorgeous | Swift 3.376 [natives] who all go *naked* | Aldrich S 44 Richard went *poorly clad.* Cp Mandv 163 the folk lyggen alle naked. Similarly Wells H 119 a great multitude that would otherwise have gone *hungry.*

But we have the adverb *deep* in Bennett P 271 The affair went too deep for tears (cf Wordsw 590 Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears).

**17.2₄.** Other quasi-predicative adjectives after verbs of motion (but it must be remembered that the forms *fast*, *slow*, *easy* and *quick* are frequent as adverbs in some combinations where they cannot be called quasi-predicatives, and therefore may be felt as adverbs in these sentences, too): Ru Sel 1.479 *going fast* is no more paradisiacal than *going slow* (but ib 475 walked they ever so slowly) | *go easy* | Housman J 355 in easy-going tones | Collins W 294 my breath *came short and thick* | the rain *comes down heavy* | Kipl S 272 the snow was *falling pretty thick* | Stevenson T 146 they had to fire so high that the shot *fell dead* | Sh Mids I 1.134 The course of true loue neuer did *run smooth* | still waters *run deep* | Butler Er 17 we dared not let them [our horses] *run loose* | Sh LL IV 3.330 [love] *Courses* as *swift* as thought in euery power | Swift 3.192 my sloop was so deep loaden that she *sailed* very *slow* | id J 133 I *walk slow* | Mitford OV 8 he *walked* rather *lame* | Troll B 527 they *passed unseen* (often: *pass unnoticed*) | BJo A 2.106 The evening will *set red* | Brontë V 122 The sun *rose hot and*

*unclouded* | Quiller-Couch M 54 [a ship] her engines *working* dead *slow* | Austen M 187 Fanny's heart *beat quick* | Thack V 46 her heart *beat* quite *thick* | Austen E 160 she *speaks* rather too *quick* (cf ib 163 she does not *hear* quite *quick*) | Mered R 9 *breathing quick* | Caine C 159 his breath was *coming quick* | Di D 63 if it *take it off quick.*

The difference between *quick* and *quickly* in the two following passages is quite natural: in the former, but not in the latter, we have a verb of movement: Bennett P 72 I'll come back as quick as I can | ib 80 the car simply had to be bought, and as quickly as possible.

In the following passages we have forms with and without *ly* alternating: Stevenson M 264 "How *slow* you *eat*!" And yet to *eat slowly* was his own prescription | Phillpotts K 141 for others some faint weather gleam appeared to *break wild and fitfully* through the storms of their days.

The following quotations are poetical: Mrs. Browning 232 That comes *quickly*, *quick* as sin does | Clough 2.497 the sun climbs *slow*, how *slowly.*

**17.25.** Here we may place also Thack N 56 to know whether they attended *regular* [at church] | Hope R 23 We arrived *punctual* at our appointed time | Galsw P 11.14 in case some literary bounder comes *punctual.*

In vg speech forms like *regular*, *punctual* are used as adverbs even in combinations where they cannot in the same way as in these sentences be taken as quasi-predicatives; here we may interpret: be regular in their attendance, etc. Lawrence LG 118 he bowed very deep and reverential: here *deep* evidently is the adverb, but *reverential* seems rather a quasi-predicative.

**17.26.** After *live* and *die* we have often quasi-predicative substantives: Ch T 4.623 if thou *deye a martir* | Dekker F 1240 he *dyed a begger* | Sh Ado I 1.248 I will *liue a batchellor* | Congr 256 I'll *die a martyr*, rather than disclaim my passion.—This is still very common.

Thus also with adjectives: Browning 1.526 They were *born poor*, *lived poor*, and *poor* they *died.*

**17.27.** Quasi-predicative adjectives are frequent with the usual verbs of state: *lie*, *stand*, *sit*, *hang*: Sh H 4 B III 1.31 *Vneasie* lyes the head, that weares a crowne | Di D 231 to think of the fallen leaves lying *thick and wet* upon the

paths | Stevenson M 217 where the mountebank lay *sick* | Bennett L R26 the splendid rôle of efficiency and brightness seemed to lie a little *heavy* upon her | Ru Sel 2.36 the road lies *level* for a league or two | he stood *firm* | H4B V 2.45 This new and gorgeous garment, Majesty, Sits not so *easie* on me, as you thinke | time hung *heavy* on our hands | his honours sit *easy* on him | Shelley 29 The dim and horrid moon hung *low*.

Of course *easy* and *low* may be considered adverbs here. Defoe often uses *live* with quasi-predicative G 101 to liv *gay* | R 229 I lived *easy* enough | M 126 I would live as *close* and as *narrow* as he could desire. Nowadays, the adverbs in *-ly* would be used here. — NED takes *still* in *lie*, *stand still* as the adv., because OE here always has *stille*, not *stillu*, etc. — Note "he stood *firmly* on his feet" (Sweet § 376).

*Sound* should be considered an adverb in the frequent phrase *I slept very sound* (e. g. Defoe R 323, Swift 3.298, Johnson R 49, Scott Iv 81, etc.) exactly as in *(be, fall) sound asleep*, which is still the regular phrase, while with the verb *sleep* the form *soundly* is now preferred (Di C 20, etc.), except perhaps in Scotland. Both are found together in Browning 1.205 The innocent sleep soundly: sound she sleeps. In combinations like *they beat him soundly* the form without *-ly* cannot be used. — *Heavy* must probably be taken as quasi-predicative in Brontë J 170 when people get elderly, they often sleep heavy (the adv. *heavy* is obsolete, except in combination with a participle, as *heavy-laden*). Cf Stevenson T 224 it was like music to hear my friends snoring together so *loud* (adv.!) and *peaceful* in their sleep.

**17.2₈.** The use of substantives as quasi-predicatives is rare and literary (not colloquial) after these and similar verbs: Carlyle R 1.78 boys *sitting prisoners* | Ru Sel 1.5 the city *lay one labyrinth* of delight | Holmes A 76 I'd rather *laugh a bright-haired boy* Than *reign a grey-bearded king*.

**17.3₁.** Verbs like *speak* and *talk* are often combined with adjectives which must be taken as quasi-predicatives: *speak fair*, *hoarse* = 'be fair, hoarse when speaking'; but often the description is rather of what is said than of the speaker, and then *rough*, etc., might perhaps be taken as an adverb (or as a kind of neuter object comparable to the objects mentioned in 12.6₇). Examples: Greene J 4 374 to speak you *faire* (frequent in Sh GE 58, etc.) | Sh As II 4.57 Thou speak'st *wiser* than thou art ware of | Congreve

285 he talked very *sensible* now | Swift J 141 I talk *dry and cross* to him | Defoe G 129 you can't speak *plain* | id Rox 188 Amy talked *big* | ib 306 Amy replied somewhat *rough and short* | Austen E 158 speaking *plain* enough | Di D 263 to speak extremely *gruff* | Collins W 101 I am sorry I spoke so *rough* to you | ib 472 he found his wife and Sir Percival whispering together quite *familiar* | Stevenson T 82 The captain never spoke but when he was spoken to, and then *sharp and short and dry* | ib 113 he spoke as *hoarse* as a crow | Philpotts K 205 he looked mad and he spoke *mad* | Shaw Ms 172 Dont talk *silly* | id D 216 to talk *clever* | id C 26 he talks *big* because he knows I have no money (also Wells N 299, etc.) | Galsw Frat 326 Would he talk *wild*, or would he talk *sensible*?

In some, but not all, of these instances adverbs in *-ly* might have been used, sometimes with a difference which is not easily definable. Congreve 251 I spoke you *fair and civil*... you heard t'other woman speak *civilly* to me; note here *you*, but *to me*. *Low* in Sh Ado II.1.103 Speake low if you speake loue, etc., is an adverb; thus also *loud;* note the combination of *low* with an adv. in Alden W 44 she answered *low, but frankly*, but with an adj. ib 76 he spoke *soft and low*. — A quasi-predicative subst is rare: Sh Oth II.3.281 Drunke? And speake *parrat?* [Tw. I.5.115 he speakes nothing but madman].

**17.32.** With *speak fair* is probably to be ranged the frequent phrase *to bid fair* (with inf. = to give a fair promise of, be likely to); the superlative is found in Fielding 8.416 a house which seemed to bid the fairest for hospitality of any in Ryde.

**17.33.** Similar quasi-predicatives are used with *play:* Benson D 21 Jack had a great idea of fair play, and Fate certainly was not playing *fair* | Darwin L 3.10 Lyell's memory plays him *false* | Shaw D 223 every man's nerve plays him false | Hope Q 312 his body had played him false | Doyle S 5.47 Moran played *foul*.

**17.34.** Adjectives denoting age are frequently used as quasi-predicatives with verbs which denote principal phases of one's life: Gissing H 233 I was *married young* myself | McKenna S 112 My father rather offended him by *dying*

*young* | Galsw Ca 689 I believe in *marrying young* | Butler W 83 rich men who *die old* | Wells JP 76 he's *beginning young* | Galsw M 254 those *who begin to suffer young.*

This is evidently different from such cases of ordinary apposition as "Thomas Brown, *a young solicitor*, married last year". Note that it is impossible to say, e. g., *he wrote novels young* or he *built that house young.*

"He married young" must be analyzed in the way indicated above 'he married when he was young' or 'he was young when he married'. *Young* thus could not be called an adverb, and we could not substitute "he married youthfully". We see also a clear difference between this quasi-predicative and a real adverb descriptive of manner in NP '12 He married *young and unhappily.* On the other hand the analogy of "he married young" leads to "he dresses young",which must be differently analyzed, for it means 'dressed like a young man, dresses youthfully', and *young* might therefore be called an adverb, though dictionaries do not recognize an adverb *young.* Exx. Troll B 73 (where it is used together with a real predicative) She neither dressed young, nor talked young, nor indeed looked young | Locke FS 161 She dressed ten years younger than was seemly.

**17.35.** A few additional examples of quasi-predicatives: the fire *burns clear* | Darwin L 1.122 the study fire must be *burning low* (adv. ?) | Galsw Frat 243 his ears *burned crimson* | Kipl S 263 the baize doors *fitted tight* | Hope Z 42 we're *eating dry* | Hope King's M 99 she *reigned absolute* in her own dominion. Cf also the examples with *cut*, *eat* and *read* in 16.81.

**17.36.** A quasi-predicative may be combined with a real predicative: Galsw TL 295 on the whole, she was safer *married* | Rose Macaulay O 237 Some people could be happy *idle*, others could not | Walp OL 216 You'll be happier *dead.*

Quasi-predicatives are found after passives: Maxwell EG 269 the place was packed *tight* | Austen S 368 nothing was ever carried on so *sly* | Wells U 39 to be dressed "*odd*", to behave "oddly" (note the difference between the two forms). | Goldsm V 1.19 my eldest son was bred a scholar.

**17.37.** Is the name of a party after *vote* to be termed a quasi-predicative? Examples: Bennett C 1.195 he had voted *Liberal* | ib 2.177 to vote *Tory* | ib. 2.202 he voted *Labour* defiantly [obj. ?].

## Predicatives.

**17.41.** The first paragraphs (17.41—43) contain examples which one might perhaps feel tempted to class as quasi-predicatives.

Verbs of motion with predicatives in some cases approach the meaning of 'to be' (though, as we shall see in 18.2, they generally take the meaning 'to become'). Thus in the common phrase *it will go hard:* Sh Merch III 2.292 it will goe hard with poore Anthonio | Gissing R 173 when life went hard with me. Further: Browning 1.407 What hand and brain *went* ever *paired?* | Butler Er 227 the system which *passes current* among the Erewhonians | Brontë V 100 an alley, which *ran parallel* with the very high wall | it *comes in useful* (not 'becomes useful', but 'is useful when it comes').

**17.42.** *Stand* with a substantive as predicative is used in a small number of set phrases only: GE A 53 I wouldn't have *stood godmother* to you | Pinero B 102 you *stood best man* | Shaw 2.149 I *stand sentinel* | Fielding T 4.275 so entirely had the Devil *stood his friend* | Di D 609 if she had not stood my friend (similarly Brontë W 214 her friend, McCarthy 2.601 their friend, Collins W 310 your friends, etc.) | *stand sponsor.*

In all these combinations, *stand* has kept much of its full meaning of standing in an upright position.

*Stand* with adjective predicatives is used in a weakened sense, so that it approaches the meaning of the empty link 'be': Sh Hml III 3.1 nor stands it *safe* with vs To let his madness range | Merch III 2.56 that the comparison May stand more *proper* | Goldsm V 1.126 I stood *neuter* | Cowper L 2.8 if there lives a man who stands *clear* of the charge of careless writing, I am that man | Ward E 141 she wished she had stood *firm* | Doyle M 57 you stand about six feet *high.*

The use with a passive participle, as in Shaw StJ 27 *I stand rebuked,* will be dealt with elsewhere.

*Hang* is used of an uncertain state: Hope Q 97 she hung doubtful | Wells PF 106 Everything between us hung arrested (rare).

**17.43.** *Play:* in the sentence "Ellen Terry played Ophelia" we may say that *Ophelia* means 'the role (part) of Ophelia' and therefore call it the object of *played;* note that it is possible to turn it into the passive "Ophelia was played by Ellen Terry". But if we are not thinking of the role as such, we may call *play* an intransitive verb with a predicative; thus also in Sh H 5 V 1.85 Doeth fortune play *the huswife* with me now? | Collins E 257 old university men play *the youngsters.*

*Act:* Pope Man 4.201 the monarch acts *the monk* | Defoe R 2.158 I would act *the clerk* between them | id Rox 77 he told me I had almost acted *the confessor* to him | id M 246 My governess acted a true mother to me | Mered E 88 De Craye will act *best man* for me.

*Come* with a predicative (with the definite article) means 'to act as': Mered H 5 he'll be coming *the Marquis* | Bennett Cd 63 I wasn't going to have Fearns coming *the duke* over me | Allen S 118 it's no use coming the *high and mighty* over me (also Curle L 54) | Zangwill G 242 You seem to go a hundred miles out of your way to come *the truly British* | Bennett LR 329 he had meant to patronize them and come *the heavy swell* over them.

**17.51.** Next we come to those cases in which no one can doubt that we have real predicatives.

Predicatives are frequent with verbs meaning *appear* or *seem,* both with these two general verbs and those more special verbs which mean 'appear to some special sense'. Examples of the first:

Sh Merch II 9.73 Still more *foole* I shall appeare By the time I linger here | Walp Cp 309 No servant had any right to appear so wildly *delighted* to see a new mistress | nobody seems *anxious* to see us | this seemed *a big affair* | Walp Cp 56 Her old black dress that had seemed almost *smart* for the St. Dreot funeral now appeared most des-

perately *shabby* | Benson D 2.47 he seemed so much *older* than his years as Dodo appeared *younger* than hers. Thus also *show:* Sh Oth V 2.203 this acte shews *horrible and grim*—and *prove:* Sh Mids V 1.317 he might yet recouer, and proue *an asse* | Swift 3.309 if any of them proved *vicious* (= showed himself to be; but *prove* often comes to mean nearly 'to become', see Sh-lex.).

*Appear* may also mean 'come into sight', The airship appeared, a small speck above the sea (extraposition) | The airship appeared as a small speck above the sea—different from "The airship appeared a small speck above the sea" ('looked like', without the notion of coming into sight).

**17.52.** Examples after verbs meaning 'appear to some special sense'.

Sh Ro II 2.43 that which we call a rose, By any other name would *smell* as sweete | Swift 3.345 I observed the flesh to smell very rank | Kipl L 118 the sea smelt good | Vachell H 221 Custom stales all good things, but how delicious they *taste* at first! | Walp Cp 208 she put sugar into her egg . . . why it tasted so strange || Di D 122 the voice of the clergyman, *sounding* remote in the open air | Shaw P 231 That sounds promising | Carroll L 31 This sounded a very good reason | ib 34 This sounded nonsense to Alice || Sutro F 46 that remark *rings* hollow | Gissing H 81 his voice rang true || the carpet *feels* soft | he feels unhappy (cf 16.23) | Bennett W 2.184 Matthew stopped, looking a fool and feeling one | Pinero M 38 I feel no end of a man.

**17.53.** Here we may mention the curious use of *strike*, which has become intransitive through the omission of an object (people, or anyone) and then can be combined with a predicative: it strikes *nice and warm* in coming in | Di T 2.98 [the cell] struck *cold and damp*, but was not dark | Ward F 227 the room struck *bare* | Masefield M 231 the night struck *cold.*

**17.54.** To express how something appears to the sense of sight we have various verbs that take, or can take, a predicative: Sh Merch V 1.1 The moone *shines* bright |

Brontë J 138 the eyes shone dark and wild | Mason R 29 A long way below him the lights of Chamonix shone bright and very small | Galsw F 209 the moon shone clear | ib 332 the soft dusk wherein the flowers in her hair *gleamed* white || Wells Fm 67 these things *stood out* clear and dazzling against a background | Ru Sel 1.193 their foreheads *come dark* against the sky, or their petticoats white against it (but with adv. ib 194 a pollard willow comes greyly against a cloud, or gloomily out of a pool).

**17.5₅.** The chief verb here is *look*: Sh Ro II 4.218 shee lookes as pale as any clout | Hughes T 2.214 he felt and looked very foolish | Austen M 35 a husband who looked the gentleman | Doyle St 90 you're not looking quite yourself | Lang T 10 Tennyson looked the poet that he was | Wells F 141 he would have looked own brother to Mr. Kenna | London A 82 Sheldon looked the picture of despair.

Note especially the use of the participle in Hope D 72 what sort of a looking person is this Miss B? | Norris O 81 he uttered to his image in the glass: "What a mug! Good Lord! what a looking mug!!"

The original meaning of look is effaced in *Look sharp*! (= 'be quick!') | Bennett Loot 181 put your hands up, and *look slippy*!

**17.5₆.** The original meaning of *loom* seems to be 'to move up and down', of a ship; but now it generally means 'to appear indistinctly' and very often takes a predicative: it loomed large | Tennyson 254 the haze of grief Makes former gladness loom so great | Housman J 290 the walls loomed black above them | NP 12 some period that looms heroic through the distorting mist of history | Mason R 144 He loomed up in her thoughts a relentless and sinister figure. —With *loom large* may also be compared *bulk large* (Carlyle and Wilson in NED, Housman J 35 the catastrophe bulked large); *bulk* 'to be of bulk' comes to mean 'to appear' with regard to bulk.

**17.5₇.** Instead of a predicative adjective we can often use an adverb with these verbs of appearance. *The egg tastes good* means 'is good to the taste, or judged by the taste'; *the egg tastes well* means 'has a good taste' (NED

Walton, not much used). In London M 178 "Tamalpais [a mountain] *bulked hugely* by the Golden Gate"—the author might just as well have said *bulked huge*. The reason for the two forms is not very obvious in Aumonier OB 36 There was very little furniture, but it all *seemed so different* from the room downstairs. It *smelt differently*, *looked different* and *felt different*. In Seeley E 60 "This appears clearly from the argument which is often urged against emigration" = the adverb *clearly* means 'in a clear way' and refers to the manner in which 'this appears'; if *clearly* had been placed before *appears*, it would mean nearly the same thing as 'evidently' and would refer to the whole sentence (it is evident that this appears . . .). But if the writer had said . . . *appears clear* . . ., *clear* would be the predicative adjective: 'appears to be clear'. Note the difference between *he looked angry* (= he was angry, to judge from his look) and *he looked angrily* (= he sent an angry look), the latter only with some complement like *at her*, etc. In the following quotation there is a kind of pun (*hard* is an adverb): James A 1.162 Some of the ladies looked at him very hard—or very soft, as you please.

With *look* an adverb was formerly frequent, where now the form without *-ly* would be used: Sh As II 7.11 What, you looke merrily! | Hml III 2.133 how cheerefully my mother lookes | Mary Shelley F 81 she looked very strangely. Both forms are employed in Sh H4A V 2.13 Looke how he can, or sad or merrily (cf Ch A 289 [he] loked holwe, and therto soberly).

**17.61.** *Make* with a predicative has two sources. In the combination with a substantive it means originally 'produce', and often the substantive might naturally be considered an object, thus in "these fruits make a delicious dish when served with cream". Cp also Kingsley H 40 "I watched the boy's hands, and he will make a man, and I will make him one. However, we may as well make him useful at once; so give him an oar". In the following examples I do not scruple to use the term predicative:

he will make a good husband | Brontë P 3 my turn of mind qualifies me to make a good tradesman | McCarthy 2.110 Mr. Walpole made a painstaking and conscientious Home Secretary.

But with an adjective predicative the usage goes back to an old reflexive (16.2₇). Examples without the reflexive pronoun: (NED 1320 he wiþ two houndes mirie made) | Ch G 1195 Sitte we down, and lat us mery make | Sh H4A IV 4.39 And 'tis but wisedome to make strong against him | Wiv II 2.262 I will first make bold with your money | AV Jes 31.4 in the daunce of them that make merry | Luke15.29 that I might make merry with my friends | Swift 3.120 I make bold to tell her majesty | Quincey 298 he caught me once making too free with his throat.

Dr. Johnson called *make bold* 'a phrase not grammatical, though common'. — In modern usage *make* is used in this way with *merry*, *bold*, and *free*, but hardly with other adjectives. Cf however Jacobs L 18 the barge ran alongside the quay and made *fast* — which cannot in the same way be explained from the reflexive use.

**17.6₂.** A subdivision under the verbs which take a predicative are those which mean 'be as it was, in the past, be still':

*keep:* Sh H4A III 2.43 Opinion Had still kept loyall to possession | keep cool, etc.

*hold* (not so frequent in this construction as keep): Sh Lr IV 7.85 Holds it true, sir, that the Duke of Cornwall was so slaine? | the argument still holds good.

*continue*: Sh John III 1.252 continue friends | Defoe R 2.206 the weather continued calm | id M 73 he was too honest a man to have continued my husband after he had known I had been his sister | Keats 4.100 Devonshire continues rainy.

*remain:* he remained silent.

*stay:* London M 117 I wish dead people would stay dead.

*rest:* Sh As I 2.298 I rest much bounden to you | Cæs V 3.17 I may rest assur'd | Oth V 2.335 you shall close prisoner rest. Now especially with *assured*, *contented*, *satisfied:* Bennett A 138 her father would not rest satisfied for long.

*persist* (rare) Mi SA 249 they persisted deaf.

**17.6₃.** There are a few more verbs which can take predicatives:

*sham* (= 'pretend to be') Kipl S 156 he's shamming hurt (also ib 150). Both *sham dead* (Mitford OV 100, Wells J P 72 and *sham death* (obj.) are said.

*make believe*, rarely found with a predicative: H. Fletcher New Menticulture 1903. 96 by occasionally making believe mad at something.

*he pleads guilty* originally contains "guilty" as a quotation: he says "[I am] guilty" in his pleading; but now *guilty* may be apprehended as a predicative: 'professes to be' Fox 1.68 Arago pleaded guilty to the definition of Tories imputed to him in England.

*fight shy:* Wells N 314 even the leaders fought shy of dinner-parties | they fight shy of him 'avoid meeting him'.

*average* is used with a predicative, meaning 'to be on an average' in Whitney Language 472 its Saxon words average less than half as long as those of other derivations (more often with an object).

*weigh*, chiefly with *heavy:* Di Do 82 it has weighed heavy upon his mind | Bennett P 131 this secret weighed heavy within him (Also adv.: Walp Cp 438 the basket and the flower weighed *heavily* upon her; *weighs light* is rarer than lightly).

*Measure:* Locke CA 122 that infernal bundle of letters, tied up with string and measuring some four inches thick.

**17.7₁.** While all the verbs mentioned so far have a meaning of their own even when they are used with a predicative which is the essential element of the predicate part of the nexus, this cannot be said of the perfectly colourless verb *be*, which is chiefly used with a predicative and which then serves only to connect this with the subject. Examples are superfluous, and the only remark needed here is that as in some cases mentioned with other verbs it is sometimes doubtful whether a form is to be taken as an adjective predicative or as an adverb: he is *deep* in love, in debt (if *deep* is an adverb, then *in love* and *in debt* are predicatives) |

Wells T 46 we were deep in a long and serious talk | the airship is *high* up in the air | Austen P 90 the man whom she could not bear to speak of the day before, was now high in her good graces.

**17.72.** After *there is* we have often combinations in which one might take an adjective or participle as a post-adjunct, but where the correct analysis is to take it as a predicative, see especially the quotations with *none* and those with substantive predicatives: Ch T 3.1356 Though ther be mercy *written* in your chere | More U 191 there was neuer man *so earnest and paynefull a follower of vertue* | Sh Hml II 2.256 there is nothing *either good or bad*, but thinking makes it so | Oth II 1.142 There's none *so foule and foolish* thereunto, But do's foule pranks | H4B IV 4.86 There is not now a rebels sword *vnsheath'd* | AV Matt 19.17 there is none *good* but one, that is God | Defoe R 2.4 there was very much of it *true* | Fielding 5.571 there was not a single person *sober* in the house | Bosw 1.316 There is no being *so poor and so contemptible*, who does not think there is somebody *still poorer, and still more contemptible* | Austen P 460 there can be only Bingley and yourself *more dear* to me | Thack N 80 somehow there are some men *gentlemen* and some not, and some women *ladies* and some not | Carlyle FR 357 there is nothing *dead* in this Universe | McKenna Sh 246 There's only one thing *worse* than losing a battle, and that's winning one.

## Predicatives without a Verb.

**17.80.** Here we shall have to speak of sentences of various types, which have this in common that they contain a predicative but no verb. In the traditional grammar, according to which a verb is normally required in every sentence, it is usual to say that in all these sentences the copula *is* (*are*, *was*, *were*) is understood; but this gives no real explanation of the phenomena. In some cases such sentences may be considered survivals of the old "nominal

sentences" (PG 120f. with indication of literature), but this cannot be said of all of them, and the history of some of the types is still insufficiently known. We have three main divisions:

(1) subject before predicative,
(2) predicative without any subject,
(3) predicative before subject.

**17.81.** First then, sentences in which the subject has its ordinary place before the predicative, but is not connected with it by a link-verb. This construction is found sometimes in exclamatory questions (literary) before a comparison or *but*: Di D 199 Who so smooth and silky as Mr. Murdstone at first! | Mi SA 1043 What pilot so expert but needs must wreck Embarqu'd with such a stears-mate at the helm? See also some of the quotations with *but* in 9.7.

There are other similar sentences in which there is only one element, e. g. Sh H6B III.2.232 What stronger brest-plate then a heart vntainted? | Merch III.2.78 What damned error, but some sober brow will blesse it? If here we want to fill in what is "wanting", it must be "is there".

**17.82.** In the common phrase *All right!* we have probably at first *all* (neutral) as the subject and *right* as the predicative adjective, as in Di X 11 to see that all was right | Browning 1.202 All's right with the world. But *all right* may also be analyzed as containing the adverb *all*, and this is the only construction possible in *That's all right!* | *Everything is all right.*

**17.83.** We must here mention what I have called "nexus of deprecation" (PG 129 ) in which a subject and a predicate (predicative) are placed together in such a way that the connexion between them is at it were brushed aside at once as impossible; the meaning is negative, and this in speech is shown by the intonation, which is the same as in questions, often in an exaggerated form and not infrequently given to the two members separately: Roister 42 *Ye a woman?* and your letter so long vnredde | Defoe G 44 Why, his grandfather was a tradesman! *he a gentleman!* |

Austen P 333 *She a beauty!* I should as soon call her mother a wit! | Thack N 802 [a newspaper] showed him up as a radical, a sepoy republican, and so forth, to the wrath and indignation of Colonel Newcome. *He a republican!* he scorned the name. *He an enemy of our beloved church!* He esteemed and honoured it | Locke FS 209 The denunciation rang in his head day and night. *He arrogant, uncharitable, cruel?*—See PG 180 on infinitives in similar sentences.

**17.84.** In a related construction two words are joined by means of *and*, the former taking the part of the subject and the latter that of a predicative; this is chiefly used to express scorn: Sh Macb V 1.41 Fye, my Lord, fie, a souldier and affear'd? [how can a soldier be afraid? it should be impossible to connect the two ideas; or: are you a soldier and yet afraid?] | Doyle R 10 Of course he'll come. A sailor and afraid of the weather!

Note the construction with first a predicative and then *and* plus an infinitive: Scott Iv 261 thou a leader of a Free Company, and regard a woman's tears!

**17.85.** In a related popular idiomatic construction we have *and* followed by a subject and predicative without a verb. The combination implies a contrast with what precedes and generally indicates surprise. The whole resembles a nexus-subjunct ("absolute construction") and often means the same thing as a clause with *though*: "How could you talk in that way, and your mother present to hear it?" = your mother being present, or, though your mother was present. Exx.: [Ch E 700, Mal 95] | Fulg 35 ye do but mocke To speke to me of ony wedlocke, *And I so yonge a mayde* | Roister 24 Ye muste come in to hir out of all doutes. *—And my work not half done*? [Marl T 244] | Sh R 2 IV 1.129 And shall the figure of Gods maiestie, His captaine . . . Be iudge'd by subiect, and inferior breathe, *And he himselfe not present?* | Ro I 5.5 When good manners shall lie in one or two mens hands, *and they vnwasht too*, 'tis a foule thing | Tim III 1.50 Is't possible the world should so much differ, *And we aliue* that liued? | Swift J 285 I envy people maunch-

ing and maunching peaches and grapes, *and I not daring to eat a bit* | Sheridan 333 (a surgeon speaking) A dead man, *and I by!* | Burns 3.124 How can ye chant, ye little birds, *And I sae weary fu' o' care!* | Thack Hog 90 How could I tell Mary of this behaviour of Mrs. Hoggarty, *and Mary in such a delicate condition?* | Brontë W 37 I've cried to myself to watch them growing more reckless daily, *and I not daring to speak a syllable* | Bennett RS 229 you should be able to control the chimney better than this—*and your master so ill!* | id P 171 objects of art, any of which Mr. Prohack might have pocketed *and nobody the wiser* | Lewis MS 438 I couldn't stand all the others laughing and swimming, *and you not there.*

In dialectal and vulgar speech the absolute form of the pronoun (the old oblique case) is used: Scott OM 59 that I suld live to be ca'd sae, *and me a born servant* o' the house o' Tillietudlem! | Barrie M 257 It would be a wild, presumptious thing, and *him a grand minister!* | Shaw A 113 why didn't you say so before? *and us losing our time* listening to your silliness! | Bennett Cd 188 I'm not going to have any woman rummaging about my house, *and me in bed.*

As what I have printed here is only a small selection of the examples of this construction which I have collected chiefly from books showing colloquial language, I am surprised to find Onions AS 67 mentioning the construction (with a nominative) as "rare and poetical", while he says that in colloquial language there is a similar construction with the accusative: "How could the room be cleaned, *and me with my rheumatism?*" — which is not exactly parallel with the construction I have exemplified above. Our construction is rather frequent as a continuation of a nexus introduced by the preposition *with:* Carlyle R 1.64 'tis a pity that thou shouldst sit yonder with nothing but the eye of Omniscience to see thee, and thou with such a gift to speak | Di N 759 The picture of his death-bed, with Nicholas at his side tending and supporting him, and he breathing out his thanks and expiring in his arms ... drove him frantic | Barrie M 102 But with such a to-do in Thrums, and she the possessor of exclusive information, Jean's reverence for Gavin only took her as far as the door.

**17.8$_6$.** In the second class mentioned in 17.8$_0$ we have predicatives, without a subject and without a verb. This

is frequent in emotionally coloured exclamations, in which it is not felt to be necessary to say expressly what one is talking about, as it is obvious from the whole situation, as when pointing to a landscape one says "Beautiful!" Similarly in leave-taking Hankin 3.119 Good-bye, then, dear. Such a pleasant evening | Shaw D 41 Dee-lightful couple! Charming woman! Gifted lad! Remarkable talent! Graceful outlines! Perfect evening! Great success! Interesting case! Glorious night! Exquisite scenery! Capital dinner! Restful outing! Good wine!, etc.—Further in some stock phrases of excuse or regret, such as: *Sorry, my mistake* (Mackenzie S 509, Bennett LM 81, P 79) | *Just my luck* (= I am unlucky as usual, e. g. Masterman WL 116) | Black Fort 283 then we go on to the Braes—*worse luck* for me. Cp further Swinburne L 198 if Frank likes her, *well and good* | *No matter* [e. g. Sh Tp III 3.41, i. e. it is no matter, it is of no importance] | Ward D 2.167 And *what matter*, so long as everything one does disappoints oneself? | Ru Sel 1.204 the more knowledge he obtained, therefore, *the better* | Kaye Smith T 78 *All the more reason* for you to marry again (cf. 17.9$_6$; 17.9$_8$).

This is frequent with exclamatory *what* and *how*: What pretty flowers! | What a beautiful view! | How dreadful!

**17.8$_7$.** There is an interesting way of adding such isolated predicatives by means of *and* (cp the use of *and* 17.8$_4$): Fielding TJ 2.89 I am resolved to leave your house this very morning.—*And a good riddance too* | GE A 100 [the porridge] might ha' been a trifle thicker *an' no harm* | Hughes TB 2.147 the two crowds are mingled now, *and no mistake* | Collins W 28 they went away yesterday, in despair, *and no wonder* | Di F 877 you may go *and welcome* | Gissing R 6 let it be confessed, *and there an end of it* | Butler ER 106 of course they had; *and a good thing too* | Mackenzie C 15 Anyway, she decided, they were gone, *and a good riddance* | Walp C 67 Ryle was frankly frightened by the Archdeacon, *and a very good thing too!* | Birmingham W 17 you're angry, *and small blame to you.*

**17.8₈.** There is a peculiar type of exclamatory sentence briefly referred to in 4.7: it consists solely of a primary word followed by a restrictive relative clause. The examples are arranged according to the role the relative plays (or would have played if it had been expressed) in the relative clause:

Sheridan 209 A good, honest trade you're learning, Sir Peter! | Thack S 100 Brilliant touch Emily has | id N 359 If there is nothing in the cupboard, a pretty meal they make | GE A 178 A pretty building I'm making, without either bricks or timber | Kipl S 253 A most filthy mind you have, Tulke | Wells V 158 Queer letters he writes, she said | Galsw D 249 A charming birthday present, that would make! | id T 4 a volume of Voltaire—curious fascination that Frenchman had, for all his destructive irony! | McKenna M 340 Curious brain Carroll must have had || Galsw P 3.12 Pretty mess we shall be in by then | id MP 336 A pretty pass young men were coming to! || Troll B 168 Traitors that they were! | Bennett C 2.188 Confounded nuisance women are! (Cf 8.1₈).

**17.8₉.** Such sentences cannot be explained as complete ordinary sentences with front-position of the object or predicative as the principal idea, i. e. as if the first and the last sentence were transposed for "You're learning a good, honest trade" and "Women are confounded nuisance" (for "*a* c. n.") in the same way as we have a transposition in "Right you are" or in Di D 112 A most unaccountable delusion it is. There can be no doubt that our sentences contain relative clauses (chiefly contact-clauses, but some with *that*), and in those already quoted it is natural to take the introductory words as isolated predicatives—we might say of some words like "It is" left out through prosiopesis. But we have other sentences of evidently the same type to which this analysis is not applicable, and in which we should rather say that the words before the relative clause are the subject of some predicate like "is surprising" left out by aposiopesis. This illustrates the difficulties that

arise as soon as we begin to speculate what is "understood" in inarticulate or semi-articulate sentences (PG 308): the safest position is for the grammarian to say that we have here complete, though not articulate, sentences. Examples of the class I have just been referring to:

Ch Parl 669 A! lord! the blisse and joye that they make! | Di D 426 The work she did that day! | Swinb L 55 but the things the woman used to say! | Shaw Ms 17 Hypatia! How can you! The things that girls say nowadays! | Mackenzie S 1.26 The slappings I've had || Bennett GS 267 The way he grumbled about his feet being cold! || Di D 783 Dear Agnes, the happiness it is to me, to see you once again! | Mered EH 45 Ah! the man their father was! | Wells TB 2.62 George, the things women are! | id V 272 The fool I have been! | Walpole C 272 The hypocrite that he felt himself as he said this! | ib 486 The skunk that Morris is!

Note the tag-question in Kipl S 246 Vile prose Cicero wrote didn't he?

**17.91.** We now come to the third class mentioned in 17.80.

A frequent construction in colloquial speech consists in placing the predicative first and then the subject without any verb at all. This word-order is generally due to a strong emotion; very often the predicative is pronounced without the speaker at first intending to let anything else follow, so that if the subject is sent after it, it is as a kind of afterthought or tag, which may be said to be in extra-position: the construction thus in some way may be called the counterpart of that in 17.12.

The same phenomenon is common in many languages, see PG 121f., further Spanish: Galdós, Doña Perfecta 69 Muy lejos de mi ánimo afirmar que es un prodigio, etc. Cf also Bally, *Stylistique franç.* 311 ("dislocation des membres de la phrase"). — In Hebrew, where there is no verb 'be', this is the usual expression; thus also in Egyptian.

The preposed predicative is an adjective: Sh Shr IV 5.38 *Happy* the parents of so faire a childe; *Happier* the

man whom fauourable stars Alots thee for his louely bed-fellow | Mids I 1.74 *Thrice* blessed they that master so their blood | Mi SA 1049 *Happy that house* | Shelley 457. 169 Narrow The heart that loves . . . One object and one form | By D J 14.77 *Thrice happy* they who have an occupation | Thack V 24 Happy the man who wins her! | Brontë V 451 *far from me* such shifts and palliatives | Tenn 256 *Thrice blest* whose lives are faithful prayers | Ru C 99 *Quite serious*, all this, though it reads like jest | Kipl M 227 *Beastly mean* of Hicksey, that | Zangwill G 167 *Not bad*, those old times, eh?

A special form is seen in Shelley 165 *Not his* the load of any secret crime . . . *Not his* the thirst for glory or command | Tenn 222 *Not ours* the fault if we have feeble hosts.

Sh Sonn 37.14 "then ten times happy me" does not belong here (imitation of Latin, cf Gent V.4.84 Oh me unhappy).

Poets sometimes use verbless predicatives in dependent clauses: Wordsw P 2.410 wonder not If high the transport, great the joy I felt | ib. 4.431 though weak his step and cautious, he appeared to travel without pain. Here, of course, we have not the same emotional reason for this word-order as in ordinary conversation.

**17.92.** The predicative is a substantive (with an adjunct) in: Sh Macb IV 3.191 *An older and a better souldier* none That Christendome giues out | Goldsm 658 *Pretty encouragement* this for a lover! | By 756 *Strange sight* this Congress! | Kingsley H 88 *A degenerate age* this, my son | Di N 295 "*Odd people* those" | Tenn 562 *iron-hearted victors* they | Gissing B 234 *No wolf in sheep's clothing* he! | Hope Q 117 *Not promising materials* these, out of which to make happiness | Gals P 2.51 *Awful rotters*, those Portuguese! | id T 17 *Odd life*, a chemist's | id Ca 609 *Queer cattle*—women! | Shaw Man 20 **A serious matter* this for you and me.

**17.931.** Very frequently the postposed subject is an infinitive, as in Wordsw P 3.121 But peace! *enough Here to record* that I was mounting now | Bennett C 2.301 *Useless for him to attempt* to be gay in that house! | Far from me to assert any such thing | Brailsford S 110 Godwin, *needless to say*, takes the side of frankness | Galsw MP 367 *Better to be*

out of it all! | Hope Ch 249 *Very kind of you to come* and see us | *How splendid of you to think* of that!—In a dependent clause: Rose Macaulay P 223 they thought *how clever of her to have* had him . . .

Cp. also Marl E 1953 *As good be gon*, as stay and be benighted | BJo 3.235 *as good maim* his body as his reputation | Swift J 61 *better write* less, or write it at ten times.

**17.9₃₂.** In the same way the subject may be a verbal substantive in *-ing* (which itself may have a subject): Norris P 23 *A fine way* for Laura to act, *getting off* into corners with Sheldon | Wilde W 37 *What a nuisance their turning* us out of the club | Galsworthy P 3.11 *Just our luck, the men finding* a fanatical firebrand like Roberts for leader | Pinero S 2 *Odd, his sending* no excuse.

**17.9₄.** Very often the subject is a whole clause: Marl J 322 And *better* one want for a common good, Then many perish for a priuate man | Bunyan G 149 *True*, there are certain good steps | Butler W 88 *True*, they turned out to be impostors | Carlyle FR 357 *How true*, that there is nothing dead in this Universe | Stevenson JHF 116 *Enough* then, that I not only recognized my natural body . . . | Shaw StJ 102 I might almost as well have been a man. *Pity* I wasn't | Rose Macaulay P 198 *Queer*, that those two girls should be sisters | Galsw T 5 *Curious* that their mother's blood should have worked so differently in her two sons | Lawrence L 167 *Curious* how fresh and luminous her face looked in contrast to his | Bennett GS 236 *Funny* you should have hit on that | Russell Soc. Reconstr. 166 *Better* men should be stupid, slothful, and oppressive than that their thoughts should be free | Marl E 1019 *No maruell* though thou scorne thy noble peeres | Thack N 502 a delight so keen that *no wonder* he was gay | Kipl MOP 203 *Small wonder* that the ragged invader could only smile | Locke BV 34 his patrimony was so small that *no wonder* he worked now and then for a living wage. Cf below 17.9₈.

**17.9₅₁.** The pre-order of the predicative is particularly natural if it is accompanied by one of the words which

demand the first place, such as (1) an interrogative pronoun or adverb (chiefly used in exclamations), (2) one of the "indefinite" relative pronouns or adverbs, (3) *the* to indicate difference (OE þȳ instrumental), as in

(1) Shelley L 607 *What a beastly and pitiful wretch* that Wordsworth | ib 720 *What an infernal business* this of Manchester! | Wordsw P 9.169 *What a mockery* this of history! | Wilde W 37 *What a nuisance* their turning us out of the club | *What a pity* that he should die so soon! | Wilde In 82 *How horrid* of you to smile!

There is a colloquial phrase "*What price*" with a subject without a verb, meaning "What do you think of—" or "What is the value of— ?". It originated in the language of horse-races, as seen in the conversation in Galsw Ca 947 "Fives Deerstalker". "Eight to one Wasp". "What price Calliope?" "Hundred to eight." "Done". Galsworthy frequently makes his personages use the expression (I have about a dozen quotations from his books); he dates it from ab. 1900, see IC 105 "What price the Uitlanders?" What price indeed! A new expression, and believed to be due to her brother George."—It is, however, somewhat earlier, for Farmer & Henley have quotations from 1893 (Emerson), 1895, 1898, 1899 (Whiteing). See also Kipl S 246 (1899) What price a giddy ode? | Bennett R 41 What price going to the Turk's Head now? | id Cd 288 Sudden death of Alderman Bloor in London. What price that?

**17.952.** (2) Sh All IV 4.36 *What ere the course*, the end is the renowne | Brontë V 261 Life is still life, *whatever its pangs* | Caine P 106 It is his duty, and *whatever the consequences* to himself he ought to do it || Sh LL I 1.194 *How low soeuer the matter*, I hope in God for high words | Di D 182 *however interesting to her* the conversation in which she was taking part, a donkey turned the current of her ideas in a moment | Hope Ch 129 he would have greeted any summons, *however unreasonable* the hour.

Cp also such frequent constructions as Defoe G 17 the ladies who scorn to marry a tradesman however rich, wise, learned or religious.

**17.96.** (3) Marl J 1804 *The more villaine* he to keep me thus | Sh As II 4.16 now am I in Arden, *the more foole* I (thus also Shr V 2.90 and 128, Oth V 2.130) | By 640 I understand not this. *The happier* thou | Brontë P 24 It was my serious intention. "Humph! *the more fool* you" | Stevenson VP 80 they do not love us; *the more fools* we to squander life on the indifferent.

In such exclamations the initial *the* is often left out (by prosiopesis): Sh As III 1.16 *More villaine* thou | Ward M 34 They've offered me Hickson's place. *More fools* they, don't you think? | Kipl S 65 Don't understand a word of it.—*More fool* you! | ib 156 *More ass* you for believin' me | Mackenzie S 822 I've not been to bed at all. *More* silly ass you.

The link-verb is also often done without in dependent clauses beginning with *the*: Sh H 5 IV 3.22 *The fewer* men, the greater share of honour | Goldsm V 1.3 *the poorer* the guest, the better pleased he ever is with being treated | Bennett RS 125 they do say, *the better* the day, the better the deed || Ru Sel 1.198 *the greater and more truthful* the artists, the more they delight in symbolism.

**17.97.** To return to the combinations exemplified in 17.94, in which the predicative is placed before the clause which is its subject.

It is easy to see the difference between *true* used in this way as in some of the first quotations, and the adverb *truly*. But when *sure* is used in the same way, which is very frequent, the meaning is about the same as of *surely* as a sentence-subjunct. Examples: Sh Hml II 2.281 and sure, deare friends, my thanks are too deare a halfepenny | Defoe R 2.209 but sure such a fright was never seen | Goldsm V 2.45 Sure you have too much wisdom | ib 48 sure it was no small temptation | Austen P 365 Sure he will not leave England | Di Do 493 Don't you know, Ned? Sure you have not forgotten. Therefore *sure* may be used even in the middle of a sentence, where it must be called an adverb: Poe 26 Thou, I said, art sure no craven (cp ib *Surely* that is

something at my window lattice . . .) | London V 11 I'd eat you, I sure would. But *sure*, and *sure enough*, placed before or after the main sentence, must be taken as adjective predicates. Cp also *as sure as* (*so sure as*), frequent in Shakespeare, for instance Wiv II 1.31 reueng'd I will be, as sure as his guts are made of puddings.

*Doubtless* also from a kind of predicative to the whole thought becomes an adverb: Sh Oth III 3.243 This honest creature (doubtlesse) Sees more than he vnfolds | Gissing R 197 Doubtless it is a rare thing nowadays.

**17.9₈.** A related instance is seen in *no matter*, which from a pre-posed predicative becomes nearly a subjunct: Bale (1550, NED) No matter to you whether I be so or no | Sh Gent II 7.66 If Protheus like your iourney, when you come, No matter who's displeas'd when you are gone | Austen M 118 something must be fixed on. No matter what, so that something is chosen | Di Do 331 having somebody to whom she could talk about Mr. Dombey, no matter how humble that somebody might be | Caine C 361 No matter how wild or extravagant the assertion, there were people ready to believe it (cf ib 415 What matter whatever happened?) | Di Do 263 No matter who invites you to stay elsewhere, come home here || Bennett W 2.332 to sell it at no matter what loss | Bennett HL 364 at no matter what risk, the thing must be accomplished quickly | ib 123 in the presence of no matter whom.

Note particularly the following frequent expressions: Galsw SP 50 He must do what he thought right, *no matter what the consequences* | Maxwell EG 412 *No matter what his personal troubles*, he would not act hastily | London W 121 Never, *no matter what the circumstance*, must he dare to bite. Here we have really a double occurrence of the phenomenon in discussion: *no matter* is a pre-posed predicative without *is*, and in the clause which forms its subject, *what* is also a predicative to *the consequences*, etc., which forms the subject of the clause.

**17.9₉.** I am inclined to look upon the colloquial

*Bother that!* or *Bother parents!* as composed in the same way of a predicative (*bother* sb) and a subject, though the NED sees in *bother* the verb in the imperative or subjunctive "with implied subject after analogy of verbs of cursing", thus with the word following taken as an object; Trollope seems rather to favour my explanation when he writes (D 2.62): "Oh, bother that." "It bothers me; but it has to be done".

Another case in which it may be doubtful whether we have the sb as pre-posed predicative or the verb (in the subjunctive) is *witness*, as in Sh R 3 I 3.267 witnesse my Sonne | Zangwill G 207 C. had committed suicide by Esoteric Buddhism, as witness his devotion to Madame Blavatsky | Spencer A 1.106 I verified my uncle's prophecy; as witness the following extract from a letter (also 1.43 and often).

The ME phrase was *witness on* (e. g. Ch B 4426, C 634; without *on* G 277); *witness* thus = 'testimony'. Caxton has *witnes of* (R 72, 82); Langland PProl 191 þat witnisseth holiwrite.

---

## Chapter XVIII.

## Predicatives Concluded.

### Predicatives of Becoming.

**18.11.** The underlying notion here is 'begin to be'. In this class we have only a few instances of quasi-predicatives: Hope Q 173 shooting boots would *come in useful* | Austen M 224 they are *grown up amazing fine girls* | James RH 224 (the nurse) insisted that she would *grow up pretty* [not exactly the same as *grow pretty*] | he *fell flat* on the ground | his words *fell flat* | she *fell an easy prey* to his power of seduction | NP '25 how the man has *risen superior* to his environment | Nellie has *turned out quite a pretty girl* | Bennett B 246 one rung in the iron escape-ladder had *rusted rotten.*

Here we might perhaps have placed *flush red*, etc. 18.2₇ Hay B 33 it *came her turn* to be kissed [more usual: her turn came to...].

**18.1₂.** Among verbs which take real predicatives we shall first mention *become* and its synonyms *grow*, *get*, *wax*.

*Become* originally meant 'to come, come about' (cp What is to become of me? etc.); from the 12th c. it began to be used in its present signification 'come to be' and gradually ousted OE *weorðan*, ME *wurðen*. No examples of *become* with predicative are needed here.

*Grow*; examples abound: Sh Err II 2.74 there's no time for a man to recouer his hair that *growes bald* by nature | Hawth Sn 44 While Ernest had been growing up and *growing old*.—The natural association of this verb is with something increasing or getting bigger (*growbig* (*ger*), *old*(*er*), *strong*(*er*), also *grow better*, *worse*, etc.), but sometimes this notion has more or less vanished (cf, e. g., Sh Cæs II 4.43 I grow *faint* | Lr IV 6.5 your other senses grow *imperfect*). Is the verb ever used with *small* as a predicative?

*Wax*, now used in archaic style only; Ch B 3966 a man *wexeth fortunat* | Sh Hml I 4.87 he *waxes desperate* | Sh Ro I 5.128 it *waxes late* | Macaulay E 4.132 the zeal of the Catholics *waxed cool*.

**18.1₃.** *Get* also (from the 16th c.) has come to mean 'become'; cf above on *get oneself* 16.2₈. In Sh only in *get clear* (Merch I 1.134, Hml IV 6.19); the next examples in NED are from 1659 (*gotten loose*), 1662 (*gotten drunk*), 1700 (*get aware*); Mi PL 7.464 "lion pawing to *get free*" had perhaps deserved a place as well as these quotations. Modern examples abound with adjective predicatives; with substantive predicatives they are rare, because *get* here would easily be understood to mean 'obtain' (she got a nurse, etc.). Even in such sentences as the following, where a misunderstanding would hardly be possible, many purists would object to the use of *get* as slipshod: he is *getting quite a scholar* (never: he got a scholar) | she is *getting quite a nuisance* | it *got broad daylight* before we arrived.

**18.2₁.** Next we have some verbs, in which the notion

of movement in space has been weakened or completely effaced:

*Go:* Sh Lr II 4.289 I shall go *mad* (cf Ch Ros 263 she goth nigh *wood*) | Di Do 504 he was going melancholy mad | Maudsley (q): they go *criminal*, as the insane go mad | Di D 741 I thought I was going *distracted* | Shaw 1.204 She's gone *sentimental* | Carlyle S 148 the Church gone *dumb* with old age | Caine E 598 Elena is going a little *deaf* | Kipl L 167 he was about to go *blind* | Mackenzie PR 241 fair men nearly always go *bald* before dark men | Bennett A 139 our horse has gone *lame* | Merriman S 177 get drunk and go *dirty*, and you will die | Walp C 506 at that thought the Precentor went *goose-fleshy* all over | Hankin 3.152 If I lived down here I should go *blue-mouldy* in three weeks | ib 3.66 Has my hair gone *grey* too? | Hope C 272 her cheek went *red* as a rose | Norris O 105 his face went abruptly *pink* | Ru Sel 1.479 the world went *wrong* as usual | Mackenzie C 107 her mouth went *dry* with disappointment | London W 41 his eyes fluttered and went *shut* | Lawrence L 108 I thought you'd gone *lost* | ib 181 everything seemed to go *changed* in her | Wells PF 33 a thousand beautiful things I dreamt of saying to her went *unsaid* | ib 35 my gesture went *disregarded.*

We can hardly speak of a predicative in Di X 5 the city clock had only just *gone three* | Walp DW 335 It's *gone half-past six.*

*Go* is rare with a predicative substantive: Defoe M 265 so as never to go *a servant* at all | Kipl DW 323 he went *Berserk* | NP '21 The leaders of the Labour party are no more likely to go *Bolshevik* than is Mr. Lloyd George (note the sg *Bolshevik*, cp below *turn traitor.* 18.2₅).

Here may perhaps be placed the phrase *to go bail* | Goldsmith 611 he went security for a fellow.

**18.2₂.** *Come:* in the meaning 'become' this verb was in common use in previous centuries, see the first six quotations, in which it would not be thus used nowadays (all of them *how came . . .*, not *how did . . . come*). In present use it approaches the same signification in a few phrases,

like *come true*, while generally it has preserved more or less of its ordinary meaning: *it comes natural to me* = 'it comes to me (to my mind, to my hands) as a natural thing'.

Sh Mids II 2.92 How came her eyes so *bright?* [now: to be so bright] | Hml IV 5.130 How came he *dead?* | ib V 1.172 How came he *mad?* | H4A II 4.334 how came Falstaffes sword so *hackt?* | Austen S 128 how came they *acquainted?* | Di N 552 it came very *expensive* | ib 24 perhaps dress-making or tambour-work will come *lighter* | Haggard S 292 his presentiment had come *true* (also Kipl J 2.8) | Shaw D 196 marriage came *natural* to me (also Di D 447 and Archer A 139) | Wells TM 61 Then things came *clear* in my mind | Di N 651 the baby might possibly come *like* him in time | Lawrence L 141 he seemed to come *awake* to the world.

*Come* is rare with a substantive predicative: Sh H4B II 3.57 so came I *a widow* | Scott Iv 212 How came they *prisoners*? | Galsw F 114 just as it came *dawn* (unnatural).

*Go* and *come* with *predicatives* generally differ in that the former is used for things that are getting worse, and the latter for things that are getting better, cf "it has gone wrong, but it will come right in the end". This, however, does not apply to participles with *un-*, with which *come* is always used: it will come *undone* | Hankin 2.14 This trimming has come *unstitched* | Tracy P 229 Durrane's little plan has come *unstuck*.

**18.2₃.** *Run* is used in a certain number of combinations as a stronger synonym of *go*: Sh H4A III 1.145 I am afraid my daughter will runne *madde* | Dryden 5.376 I'm not run mad | Defoe Rox 17 she ran *distracted* (also Goldsm 669) | Brontë W 166 Catherine ran *wild* with joy at the idea | Shelley 308 my blood runs *cold* (also Galsw Ca 36). The following expressions are frequent: our stores ran *low* | the river runs *dry* in summer.

**18.2₄.** *Fall:* Sh Merch III 4.71 they fell *sicke* and died | Defoe R 17 I first fell *acquainted* with the master | Di N 607 he generally falls *tired* when he has come as far as this |

Ru S 81 our British constitution, which has fallen *dropsical* of late | McCarthy 2.88 the measure fell *dead* | Shaw P 242 his mouth has fallen *open* | Quiller-Couch M 50 He fell *silent* (very frequent) | Wells T 116 she fell *mute* | Hewlett F 94 she was apt to fall *faint* | Swinb L 217 she is fallen *miserable and ill* | Collins W 502 the money fell *short* | Stevenson T 222 Gradually the night fell *blacker* | id M 162 Night had fallen *dark*, before we came out.

A special case is *to fall* (also *run*) *foul of* = 'rush on, attack vehemently', as Philips L 210 he seizes every opportunity of falling foul of our language | Doyle S 2.71 I am a dangerous man to fall foul of.

*Fall* with a sb: She fell *an easy prey* to his power of seduction. It is unusual with *heir*: Lowes Convention 54 The marguerite falls heir to the possession of the rose.

In combinations like he *fell thinking* of his childhood | Wells Fm 36 on the way he *fell humming* — the historical explanation is found in the old construction *fall on (a)* + verbal substantive in *-ing*, in which the preposition has disappeared as in *set the clock (a) going*, etc., though now the form in *-ing* would be apprehended by most people as the participle.

**18.2$_5$.** *Turn* is frequent with adjectives of colour: *turn pale, white*; further *turn sour*. With substantives it generally means 'change sides, join another party' etc. It differs from the other verbs that take predicatives, in having the substantive without the indefinite article (*turn traitor*, but *be, become a traitor*) and often also in the use of the singular with a subject in the plural (*they turn traitor*).

Examples: Sh As I 2.23 when I breake that oath, let me turn *monster* | ib IV 1.101 Leander, he would haue liu'd many a faire yeere though Hero had turn'd *nun* | Oth II 3.170 Are we turn'd *Turkes?* | Kingsley H 153 I am turned *philosopher* | Gissing B 480 disposed to turn *optimist* | Raleigh Sh 99 the yeoman's son turned *adventurer* | ib 161 young gallants, with no intent to turn *husbands* | Hardy F 336 I'd as soon turn *king's-evidence* | Twain H 1.127 he'll turn *State's evidence*.

*He turned up trumps*, originally a card term with *trumps* as obj, is now apprehended as containing a predicative (cf *turn out*); it means 'he behaved splendidly'.

*Take sick* = 'become ill' is an Americanism: London V 93 his wife took sick, Lewis MA 19, Dreiser F 117 (but ib 263 our little boy was taken sick, as in British: he was taken ill).

**18.2₆.** The adjectives *open* and *shut* are used as predicatives after some verbs which do not otherwise take predicatives: the door *flew* (*burst*) open | Masefield S 103 The window was shut. . . . Perhaps it *blew* open | Rogers Wine of Fury 76 The window *banged* shut | London V 4 the door *swung* shut | Lewis B 100 The car door opened and *banged* shut, then the garage door *slid* open | Hergesheimer (in Marr. 47) he heard the soft impact of the door *swinging* shut.—Of these *bang shut* is the least usual; *bang to* is the ordinary expression.

Thus also *loose*: *break* loose (common) | Cowper L 1.258 some devil had broke loose | Bennett ECh 45 This button's just beginning to *work* loose.

Somewhat rarer combinations: Chesterton F 168 the priest had *sprung erect* | London A 342 *jerking free* from the arm . . . Joan had slapped his face.

**18.2₇.** *Blush;* etc.: Thack N 11 he *blushed* as *red* as a peony | Shaw 2.120 blushing fiery red || Di Do 242 she *flushed* indignant *scarlet* to her hair | Harraden S 80 she flushed *crimson* with temper | Hope D 14 her cheeks flushed red | Stevenson B 31 The lad *flashed* crimson with anger || London A 247 his face *flamed redder* || the fire has *burned low* (= has become low by burning).

**18.2₈.** *Commence* may be used with a predicative (generally without any article), meaning 'begin to be': Goldsm V 2.4 What do you think of commencing *author*, like me? | Cowper L 1.415 I commenced *carpenter* . . . I renounced it and commenced *poet* | 2.43 having commenced *an author*, I am most abundantly desirous to succeed as such | Di N 3 this promising lad commenced *usurer* on a limited scale at school | Dobson F 5 Lyttelton had already commenced *poet* as an Eton boy.

**18.2₉.** Among the activo-passive verbs mentioned above (16.8) which can take a predicative, we have here *wear*, which comes to mean "become by wear" in Quiller-Couch M 183 that crust [of a volcano] was momentarily wearing *thinner* | Wells TM 34 the curtain had worn *thread-bare* | Mackenzie S 1.160 the old intimacy was wearing *thin* | Brontë V 307 the night wore *late*.

We have also a predicative of becoming after *cut up*; this was originally a butcher's phrase, and was first used of a person's fortune as shown after death (Disraeli, NED: You think him rich? Oh, he will *cut up very large*) and now is used in slang or colloquially with adjectives denoting unpleasant qualities = 'turn out to be': Di D 539 I didn't expect he'd *cut up so rough* (also Di N 317, 711) | Masefield C 175 he may *cut up rash* | ib 283 if you *cut up nasty*.

**18.3.** The difference between *be*-predicatives and *become-predicatives* is seen also in *passives*, the former, for instance, in "He is buried at Croydon" [= lies buried], the latter in "When is he to be buried?—Oh, don't you know? He has already been buried; he was buried yesterday". Cp also "When I came at five, the door was shut [the opposite of "was open"], but I do not know when it was shut [the opposite of "was opened"]. See PG 272ff. But on this and the other auxiliary verbs used in the passive (*got* killed, *stood* corrected) it will be better to speak in a different place.

On predicatives with passives of the verbs which take a nexus-object, see vol. IV.

## What can be a Predicative?

**18.4₀.** As predicatives we find (1) substantives, (2) adjectives, (3) pronouns, (4) adverbs and prepositional groups.

**18.4₁.** The predicative is less definite, less special than the subject (see PG 150ff.). Hence, a possessive pronoun in the predicative has not the same definite meaning as in other positions: I am *your friend* means 'one of your

friends', or 'a man with friendly feelings towards you', while in 'Has your friend not yet turned up?' it means 'that one particular friend of yours whom you were expecting, or whom we had been talking of' (as if here the definite article were implied in the possessive pronoun).

**18.42.** Substantives as predicatives generally have the indefinite article, and the subject then is simply ranged as one of the class denoted by the substantive: Brown is *a fool* (= one among the innumerable fools in existence) | this is *a rose*, etc. Hope D 12 Archie may not be *a genius*, but he is *a good fellow* and *a swell* and rich; he is not *a pauper*, like Phil Meadow, or *a snob* . . . In the plural, of course, there is no article: all his sons are *fools* | these flowers are *roses*.

**18.43.** But in many cases the predicative has no indefinite article, thus if it is a mass-word: this is *wool*, not *cotton* | Philips L 268 it would be rather *fun* to entangle him. Note the difference between "N's is *a bad grammar*" (thing-word) and "'to considerably improve' is *bad grammar*" (mass-word), and the use of mass-words as predicatives even when speaking of persons (where *great fun* means not exactly the same thing as *very funny*): Hope D 77 he's *such fun* | ib 11 she's *awful fun* | Swinb L 186 he is *immense fun* | Mackenzie S 1.174 Nancy was *great sport* | Bennett W 2.244 he's *very good company*.

**18.44.** Predicatives are also used without the indefinite article when they are accompanied with adverbs indicating degree, most often *enough*: Congreve 251 I an't *calf enough* to lick your chalked face | Defoe R 2.21 I am not *philosopher enough* to determine the cause | Swift J 501 nor am I *judge enough* of Irish affairs | Sheridan 335 He's *coxcomb enough* to think any thing | Keats 5.71 whether I shall be *philosopher enough* to follow my own lessons | Austen P 354 she was *mistress enough* of herself to whisper . . . | Hardy R 129 a spot into which she was not *climber enough* to venture | Gissing H 259 I was *ass enough* to tell that girl the whole story of my life | Kaye Smith T 355 she was not *New Woman*

*enough* to dare custom so far | Spect 462 I am *more coxcomb* than fool | Kinglake E 186 the Plague was *so master* of the city, that I can't now affect to dissociate the two ideas | London M 59 he was *so much man* as to shock her with maidenly fears.

This usage does not seem to have arisen till the end of the 17th c. NED has only one quotation for *enough* (Addison).

Some grammarians say that in such combinations the substantive has become an adjective; but that is not correct, for the substantival plural form is used: Childers R 129 we were *asses enough* to give her [Germany] Heligoland. It would probably be more correct to say that the substantive here has approximately the value of a mass-word (cp the preceding paragraph): we may also remind the reader of the synonymous phrases with *much of*, etc., as in Stevenson M 166 he was by nature slothful, and *much of a vagabond* | Di Sk 475 he was *somewhat of a favourite* with his uncle (see II 17.4$_{12}$ and 17.3$_5$ similar quotations) | (q) I'm *enough of a doctor* to tell whether a man is drunk or sober | (q) Charles was *more of a gentleman* than a king, and more of a wit than a gentleman | McKenna Sh 78 she was *sufficient of an artist* to refrain from intervention.—We have three possible expressions: He was less statesman than warrior | He was less a statesman than a warrior | He was less of a statesman than (a) warrior.

With this may be compared the following ways of indicating degree, etc., in the predicative: Bennett B 90 a reverie which had *been the reverse of pleasant* | Kipl L 223 he *became every known variety of sloven* | Hardy L 138 with the money they will perhaps be *as near to gentlemen* as Emmy Lester's precious two.

**18.45.** Further the predicative has no indefinite article in combinations like "he was *bishop of Durham*" | Defoe Rox 232 I, that was so willing once to be *mistress to a King*, was now ten thousand times more fond of being *wife to a Prince*. Details must be reserved for our next volume.

For *beast that I am!* and *villain as the man was*, see above 8.17f., 9.45.

**18.46.** It may be worth while here to call attention to a somewhat similar employment of substantive predicatives: Sh H5 IV 6.6 From helmet to the spurre *all blood* he was | Maugham PV 201 She had an elegance which made Kitty feel *all thumbs* | Sh Ado III 2.10 he is *all mirth* (with other examples given under *all* II 17.58) | Brontë V 429 but already the room was *all confusion* | Kaye Smith T 117 The Princess was *all praise and graciousness* || Brontë V 69 Madame appeared *goodness itself* | Maxwell F 74 as he sat there he was *good nature and geniality personified.*—A somewhat similar use is seen in Bennett HL 8 That's *mother all over!* (= that is just like her).

**18.51.** The predicative may have the definite article: Brown was the thief | This is the book I referred to. But then as well as in some other cases, where the two words linked together by means of the verb *be* are equally definite, or nearly so, they are interchangeable, and we may doubt which of them is to be called subject and which predicative. Miss Castlewood was the prettiest girl at the ball = The prettiest girl at the ball was Miss Castlewood, see the analysis PG 153, where it is shown that there is a small balance in favour of looking upon the proper name in such sentences as the more definite word and therefore the subject.

**18.52.** In questions like "Who is the author?" or "What was the reason?" the hesitation as to what is the subject is shown in indirect questions, for we may say either "I don't know *who is the author*" or ". . . *who the author is*", either "I don't know *what was the reason*" or ". . . *what the reason was*"—while the subject is always placed before the verb where no doubt can obtain: I don't know *what the man was* | . . . *who killed the soldier* | . . . *who(m) the soldier killed* | . . . *who was ill*, etc.

**18.53.** In indirect questions corresponding to the direct *What is the matter?* we find some hesitation as to the word-order: Sh Cæs II 1.241 when I ask'd you *what the matter*

*was* | Lr I 4.61 | Defoe R 2.232 not knowing *what the matter was* | id M 172 | Shaw A 109 not knowing *what the matter is* | Walp Cp 357 you know what the matter is. But now *what* is nearly always apprehended as the subject, and *the matter* is taken as a predicative very much like the synonyms *What's wrong?* or *What's amiss?* Thus already in Defoe R 2.222 I knew not *what was the matter* | id Rox 307 Amy smiled and asked her *what was the matter* | Fielding T 4.252 he asked him *what was the matter* | Di D 420 tell me *what's the matter* (cf 2.4₂). Correspondingly we say *What can be the matter?* and not: What can the matter be?

The same analysis (with *the matter* as predicative) also lies at the bottom of the frequent constructions with *there* (cf 17.7₂): Troll B 167 there was *nothing the matter* with his temper | Brontë J 312 But is there *anything the matter?* Is there anything wrong? | Bennett W 243 there's *nothing the matter* with her | Gissing G 194 there's *nothing serious the matter* | Shaw 2.101 there is *something serious the matter* | Huxley L 2.70 there is *not much the matter* | ib 129 there ought to be *nothing the matter* with me | Walp F 386 There are *a lot of things the matter.*

*The matter* is also treated in the same way as *wrong* in other combinations: Mackenzie C 191 I can't see *nothing the matter* | London M 405 Nothing could be found *the matter* with him | Bennett C 2.71 Nothing serious could be *the matter.*

Thus also: Di D 458 Sarah has *something the matter* with her spine | Elizabeth F 71 you would not have *things the matter* with your soul [Huxley L 1.195 I can't say that the praise or blame of my audience was much matter].

**18.5₄.** There is a good deal of hesitation as to the number of the verb if the subject and the predicative are of different number and if it is difficult to decide which is subject and which predicate, see II 6.71 with Appendix.

**18.5₅.** An independent genitive case is rare in the predicative: AV 1 Cor 10.28 The earth is the Lords, and the fulnesse thereof; the 20 C. Version has: the earth and all

that is in it belong to the Lord. Thus also with a possessive pronoun; it is not usual to say *mine* in the same independent way as in AV Ro 12.19 *Vengeance is mine*, I will repay, saith the Lord (20th C.: It is for me to take revenge; cf AV Deut 32.35 To me belongeth vengeance). Cf Sweet NEG § 2009. But where a substantive is easily supplied (i. e. when it is anaphoric), the use of a genitive or of a possessive pronoun is perfectly natural: Whose ball is this? Is it John's, or yours? Cf 1.4₄.

**18.5₆.** A numeral may, of course, be a predicative, e. g. The beads were five in number. A separate case is seen in the frequent expressions in which *twenty* = 'twenty years old': Bennett ECh 197 The girl was twenty and looked seventeen | Galsw WM 159 Am I only twenty-one? I feel forty-eight. Similarly *five feet* = 'five feet high' in "he stands five feet".

**18.5₇.** Pronouns are frequent as predicatives. On the case-form see 18.9.

## Adverbs and Prepositional Groups.

**18.6₁.** Adverbs and prepositional groups (prepositions with their objects), which generally are subjuncts, may also be used as predicatives. It is sometimes difficult to know whether such a word or group is to be termed a subjunct or a predicative, though the general rule may be stated in this way: when the verb has a full meaning without the addition, we have a subjunct, e. g. *well* and *out of tune* in "she sings well" and "she sings out of tune", but the same words are predicatives in "she is (or, seems) well" and "the piano is (or, seems) out of tune". In the former combinations we have subjuncts which describe the way in which she sings; in the latter we have predicatives which are connected with the subject so as to become the necessary secondary part of the nexus. In "he seems at rest in his old age" the first prepositional group is a predicative, the second a subjunct.

**18.62.** We are therefore entitled to use one and the same term (predicative) of each of the following synonymous expressions, in spite of the fact that we have adjectives (or participles) in those before the dash, adverbs or prepositional groups in the others:

he is healthy — is well, in good health,
he is diseased — is ill (cf II 14.973),
they are related — are akin,
the rain is passed (past)—is over,
he is going—is off,
he is living—is alive,
he is free—is at liberty,
he is easy—is at ease,
it is ended—is at an end,
he is capable of any mischief—is up to any mischief, etc.

*He is in perfect health* (*at ease*) corresponds to the question "What is she?" (*what* neuter predicative), but *he is in Rome* (*at home*) to the question "Where is he?"

Therefore, adjectives and adverbs are sometimes used in parallel positions, as in the proverbial pun: some are *wise*, and some are *otherwise* | Butler Er 97 those who are either *poor* or *poorly* | Di Do 60 you are as *strong* and *well* as such little people usually are | ib 89 now that he was getting so *old* and *well*.

**18.63.** Note also the use of adverbs of degree with predicatives of this class: Doyle S 2.188 why I was *so out of breath* | James S 50 Jane's letters had been so frequent and *so beyond* even what could have been hoped | Darwin L 1.74 when old, *much out of health* | Galsw C 144 he, too, was *very out of breath* | id P 4.36 you seem *awfully down* | Gissing G 270 no man could be *more above-board* | Austen M 162 his easy indifference seemed to mark him *the most at home* of the two.

**18.64.** Among the adverbs used in this way as predicatives we must specially mention those referring to states of health, *well* (already exemplified), *unwell*, *ill* (Are you ill? You look ill) and *poorly*: Darwin L 2.149 I have been so

poorly, the last three days | Di D 69 she's poorly. It's one of her bad days | cf ib 3 My poor mother was sitting by the fire, but poorly in health, and very low in spirits.

In still another sense *well* is used predicatively in the phrases: *he is very well in his way* (e. g. Di D 163, 'satisfactory') and *it is* (*would be*, etc.) *very well for you* (if you could see it, 'fortunate') | Brontë V 5 Mrs Bretton did not hear it: which was quite as well | it is all very well for you to talk like that.

**18.65.** *Seldom* may be used predicatively in a sentence beginning with *it is*: Cowper L 1.115 It is but seldom, and never except for my amusement, that I translate | Hardy L 30 it is very seldom that I go down | Gissing R 101 In my garret-days it was seldom that I rose early. But it is impossible to say, for instance, "Such ingenuity is seldom" for ". . . rare (or, seldom found)".

*Rarely* may be used in the same way: Butler Er 202 It was rarely that I saw cases of real affection | Mitford OV 37 It is rarely that one sees the shy beauty so close | Gissing G 293 It was very rarely that Jasper had heard her laugh.

**18.66.** We shall next give examples of adverbs and prepositional groups as predicatives after verbs other than *be*:

Swift J 162 Mr. Harley *continues out of order* | Franklin 9 The family *continued* all *of the Church of England* | Conway C 71 I joined her and *continued at her side* | Bennett C 2.8 He could not *remain of one opinon* nor in one mind | Di T 2.200 they both *looked of about my own age*, or rather younger | Parker R 67 he looked *in perfect health* | Harraden F 180 she *looked a little out of health* | Street E 26 Jack was delightfully ugly and always *looked on the point of death* | Shaw 1.89 sit down and *look at home* | Galsw C 294 the rain *looks nearly over* | Maxwell F 102 to make the most bitter grief *seem already at a distance* | Benson D 2.246 do not come unless you *feel up to it* | Wilde In 4 In a house we all *feel of the proper proportions* | Di T 2.219 she *stood in dread of him.*

**18.67.** Predicatives of this kind also frequently occur with verbs meaning 'become':

Wells U 103 gently *coming awake* | Wells T 17 soldiers that *came all alive* directly you took off the lid | Williamson S 123 looking like the Apollo Belvedere *come alive* | Haggard S 183 it *came so home* to me | Carlyle S 149 those same Church-Clothes have *gone sorrowfully out-at-elbows* | Browning 1.395 fast Do I *grow* old and *out of strength* | Moulton Sh 97 another conception of Sh's portraiture *becomes of first importance* | Ru S 200 everybody will *become of use* | Holmes A 148 she quietly *turned of a deep orange colour.*

**18.68.** From *he is in love with her* we get the familiar expression *he falls in love with her* (where we should expect *into*, if *fall* is taken in its original sense), and the combinations GE Mm 125 as he had grown from boy to man, he had *grown in love* with his old playmate (also Locke F 592) | Elizabeth F 198 everybody spends their time *falling out of love* (also Locke FS 134, etc.).

Similarly from *he is of age* we get *he comes of age* (originally *come to age* as Sh H4A I 3.153); Worth S 59 I came of college age.

**18.69.** Adverbs and adverbial groups may also be used as predicative parts of nexus-objects: Austen M 184 could she have believed herself in the way | GE S 18 she held her engagement to him at an end. Thus in the passive: if the flesh is found to their taste. See further in vol. IV.

## Subjunct-Predicatives.

**18.71.** We shall here deal with the idiomatic use of substantives as predicatives of description or characterization, e. g. in: when I was *your age* | it's *no use* | the wall was *a bright yellow colour*, etc. This is termed "accusativus qualitatis" (Zupitza Anglia 15.156) or "accusative of description" (Onions AS § 80)—but why accusative?—or "a purely adjectival function" of the common case (Sweet NEG § 1987)—but why adjectival? It might just as well be called adverbial. The term here chosen seems to cover the

phenomenon best and places it on the same footing as the adverbs and prepositional groups treated in 18.6.

**18.7₂.** This idiom does not seem to be very old: I have noted only one instance (which may be doubtful) in Chaucer (B 8 the shadwe of every tree Was, as in lengthe, the same quantitee That was the body erect that caused it) and not many in Sh (see below), but from the nineteenth century examples abound. The only explanation I have found of its origin in grammars is that given by Sweet that it "apparently began through dropping a preposition" and Curme CG 110 that it is "felt as a predicative descriptive adjective, so that the genitive sign *of* naturally and properly drops out". But in *a man of fashion*, *a man of the world* the preposition does not naturally and properly drop out though the groups *of fashion* and *of the world* are even more like adjectives than the combinations dealt with here.

It is true that the older language often had a preposition where there is now generally none, thus even so late as Dickens: D 120 a van, painted *of a sombre colour* | ib 537 What's the matter? said Uriah, turning *of a deadly colour* | id N 306 It's *of no use* talking. In the last mentioned phrase *of* is still insisted on by some purists, though its general adoption is "at this time of day past praying for" (Fowler MEU 684). But a wholly gratuitous dropping of a preposition in the middle of many sentences cannot be adopted as a satisfactory historical explanation of our grammatical phenomenon: like many other grammatical phenomena this one springs from more than one source (18.7₃—7₉).

**18.7₃.** There is one position in which we may easily imagine a preposition to be dropped, namely at the end of a sentence, especially a question, and it is worthy of note that in nearly all the instances found in Shakespeare we have the form "What trade art thou?" and "What colour are your eyebrows?, with which should be compared Sh As III 2.285 What stature is she of? | BJo A 5.43 What trade art thou on?—A smith. If the preposition were dropped here, this might lead to analogous extension to cases like "he is another trade than his brother".

Similarly the use of an isolated "No use!" through prosiopesis (PG 310) instead of "This is of no use!" (in which the beginning is suppressed as in [I shall] see you again this afternoon, cf. 11.87) may lead to "This is no use".

**18.74.** It is not quite impossible that the phonetic confusion of *is* and *has* may have had a small share in the development of the idiom, as "the deck's [= deck has] a bright colour" may be analyzed as *the deck is* (cp *that's nothing to do* with his illness, where *has* is taken to be *is*, II 15.83). Some ambiguity may also be caused by the double meaning of *get*; see, for instance, Kipl L 89 your nose is getting a crude Prussian blue at the tip: *get* transitive with an object or intransitive with a predicative? Now the latter, but similar combinations may at first be due to the transitive use of *get*. We may even say that in "God made you that shape" two analyses are possible: *you* may be the indirect and *shape* the direct object, or else *you that shape* is a nexus-object, in which *that shape* is the predicative part, exactly as in "God made you crooked": the latter interpretation is shown in Sh As IV 1.37 by the continuation "you are": (you) chide God for *making you that countenance you are*.

**18.75.** The use of an expanding apposition as in "her hair was brown—a deep brown colour" may have induced people to say also "her hair was a deep brown colour" without the preceding adjective predicative; cf Ru Sel 1.258 his horse is grey, not lustrous, but a dark, lurid grey.

**18.76.** It is also quite natural in asking the price of a thing to say simply "How much"?, which leads to: How much is it? | How much are potatoes? | What price are potatoes? | Potatoes are five shillings [*are* = cost]. (Compare also the subjunct of price as in "I bought it three shillings").

**18.77.** Our phenomenon further has points of contact with that isolation of the first element of compounds which we studied in II ch. XIII, see especially 13.6: *a high-church bishop* leads to Beaconsf L 212 the Bishop was *high-church*. He is *a west-country man* leads to Shaw A 135 I'm *west country* myself. *A first-rate cricketer* leads to: he is *first-rate* as a cricketer, etc.

**18.7₈.** There is also some kinship between our phenomenon and the predicative use of mass-words: this dress is silk (cotton, etc.) | she is great fun (18.4₃).

**18.7₉.** The chief source of these constructions, however, is to be sought in the use of substantives (with adjuncts) as ordinary subjuncts. Thus in combinations with *fashion*: *we do it sailor fashion* (where *fashion* is a subjunct) leads to "this is done sailor fashion" and again to "this is *sailor fashion*", and "what fashion is it?" , see Sh Gent II 7.49 *What fashion*, madam shall I make your breeches? . . . *What compasse* will you weare your farthingale? Why, eu'n *what fashion* thou best likes | Ado III 4.15 your gown's *a most rare fashion* yfaith.

Similarly in "we paint the wall a different colour" the words *a different colour* is originally a subjunct of manner; but in the passive "the wall was painted a different colour" it may be taken as a predicative, just as in "the wall was painted red", and thus we get "the wall was a different colour", where the substantive is a subjunct-predicative.

**18.8₁.** Substantives are used as subjunct-predicatives, first after the verb *be*: Walton A 65 when I was about *the age of my daughter* | GE M 2.257 when I was *her age* | Trollope D 1.107 they were in truth *the same age* | *what age* is she? (very frequent) | Hope D 70 one's first love is never *any age* | Galsw W M 84 You'll pick up yet. You're *no age* | Cf Sh Per V 1.15 to outliue *the age I am* | Ritchie M 180 at the age that I was then, impressions are vivid.

Wells TB 2.63 Portions of the fabric are *thirteenth century.*

**18.8₂.** Sh Wint II 1.13. *What colour* are your eyebrowes? | Di D 110 I think they [his eyes] are *the colour of mine* | Stevenson M 257 Desprez was once more *the colour of ashes* | Wilde L 31 the sky was *a faint blue.*

Sh Ado III 4.62 These gloues the Count sent mee, they are *an excellent perfume.*

**18.8₃.** Kaye Smith T 96 It was not likely that Marlingate would ever be *the size* of Eastbourne | Barrie M 18 you're

just *the height* I like | Kipl J 1.55 I am *a fair length* | Twain M 37 the river is *a very different shape* on a pitch-dark night | Tenn 96 We are not now *that strength* which in old days Moved earth and heaven | Di N 253 You are *a good temper?* [Twain M 17 when he was *a mind* to; cf NED *mind* 13 a and b].

**18.84.** Sh Cæs I 1.5 *What trade* art thou? (cf ib 9,16; H4B III 3.160) | Mulock H 1.79 *What business* do you think that Mr. Charles is?

Bennett W 1.139 It seemed strange that he should be a Wesleyan. She would have been sure that he was "*Church*" | Grand T XIII *What religion* are you? | Barrie M 128 the Websters are *Established Kirk* | Are you *Oxford or Cambridge?* [i. e. which are you in favour of? in a boat-race].

Hope Ch 42 Oh, you're *the other side?* . . . *Whatever side* I was, I could not listen to that (Cf *vote Liberal, Labour*, 17.37).

**18.85.** The use of *relation* as in Di D 570 I have forgotten *what relation* Agnes is to you" or "he is *no relation* to me" is connected with the semantic change, by which *relation* comes to mean "relative, kinsman" as in "he is *no relation* of mine".

Galsw D 229 I'm *that sort* | Hope Ch 193 he's not—well, not *our sort*, as the young people say. This leads to the colloquial (or slangy): He's *a good sort* (= a good fellow).

Pinero B 244 we are vulgar and slangy, and usually *bad form* (cp *great fun, good company, bad grammar* 18.43).

**18.86.** Lytton K 348 that sum would be *more use* to you now than ten times the amount twenty years hence | Shaw D 238 I wasnt *any use* to her | Bennett A 238 Not that it will be the *least use* | Gissing G 420 *what use* should I be? | It's *no good* crying | Doyle F 143 *What good* is a steam launch without coals? | It's not *the least bit of good* | Collingwood R 128 it was too late to have been *much service* to the great artist | *What consequence* is that to you? | Stevenson JHF 200 I do not think he can be *much account* | Opie Read, Toothp T 61 the *less account* a young feller is |

ib 104 he aint *no 'count.*—Similarly after *feel*: Galsw SP 205 I only wish I could do it again; then I should *feel some use* [feel that I was some use].

**18.87.** A second use of these substantives is as predicatives of becoming: Tenn 210 she . . . *became* Her former beauty treble | Di D 552 she *turned* lead-colour | id N 409 What! snarled Ralph . . . turning a livid white | Kipl S 251 Tulke turned a rich sloe colour | GE A 69 Hetty *blushed* a deep rose-colour when Captain D. entered | Hope D 53 He blushed a fine crimson | Lawrence L 133 She looked up, flushing a deep rose colour.

**18.88.** Subjunct-predicatives are also found as the second part of a nexus-object, as Di D 132 a state of delight that made his face a burning red, — and as post-adjuncts, see II.15.71. A few additional exx. Galsw SP 166 one could not confide deep personal questions to men *half one's age* | Kaye Smith HA 331 We could never run a place *this size* | Walp Cp 57 Before her was a hideous building, *the colour of beef badly cooked* | Shaw J 143 a lump on the back of my head *the size of an apple.*

## Final Words on Predicatives.

**18.9.** The two chapters on predicatives have been particularly difficult from a systematic point of view, because the phenomena treated here present so many transitions between different grammatical categories, chiefly in consequence of the more or less effaced original meanings of the verbs concerned. A substantive is still a "primary" in extraposition, but when it stands as a quasi-predicative and still more as a real predicative, it comes to stand on the same footing as adjectives, which are in this position admittedly secondaries, e. g. *he is a gentleman and very kind to everybody.* On the other hand, adverbs and prepositional groups, which are usually subjuncts and thus tertiaries, come to be used as predicatives and thus gain the same footing as adjective predicates: *he is well*, and *he is in good health*, compared with *he is sound.* All this reminds one that there are very few hard-and-fast rules in grammar.

The parallelism between adjectives and adverbs in the

predicative position is also shown by the use of *so*: "I find his books dull".—"So they are, and so are his speeches".

The difficulties of analysis are also increased by the fact that many adverbs are in form indistinguishable from the corresponding adjective, chiefly through the dropping of OE *-e*, as in *fast* = OE adj *fæst* and adv *fæste*.

Further, we have seen in several places that objects and predicatives may run into each other, thus after *make*, *play*, *act*. The close relation between these two categories, as far as the popular speech-instinct is concerned, is manifested by the following grammatical facts:

(1) in those pronouns which distinguish an accusative case from a nominative, the former tends more and more to be used in the predicative: instead of earlier *it is I*, still retained artificially in higher literary style, *it is me* has been gaining ground in colloquial and partly in literary English for the last centuries. Both forms are found together in Sh Tw II 5.88 *That's mee* I warrant you . . . I knew *'twas I;* cf ib 112 If *this should be thee* Maluolio? Shelley, in the Ode to the West Wind, writes "Be thou, spirit fierce, my spirit! *Be thou me*, impetuous one!" (See ChE p. 99ff., which I should now be able to supplement very considerably. Of course this cannot be separated from the general tendency to use the old acc. form everywhere except where the pronoun is attached to a verb as its subject).

(2) a relative pronoun can be omitted both when it would be the object and the predicative, see ch. VII.

(3) the same word may in rare cases be at once the predicative of one verb and the object of another, as in Kipling (poem, Times 1914) For all we *have and are*, For all our children's fate, Stand up and meet the war | Browning 1.524 all that I was born to *be and do* | Walp RH 175 I've never *been or thought or said* anything interesting | Swinb L 179 pleasure in *being and doing* good. Cf also Wells V 297 To know things by name is one thing; to know them by *seeing them and feeling them and being them* quite another. —Dean Alford (Queen's E. 103) blames the Oxford Decla-

ration of the Clergy for describing the Canonical Scriptures as "not only *containing but being* the Word of God".

The same parallelism between a predicative and an object is seen in Kipl L 237 when you *get shaved, and some clothes*—an expression which most people would think 'too clever'.

On the neuter gender of predicatives see 6.4₄, 6.8₂, 6,8₄ 8.1₆ and PG 242.

# Index.


## A.

*abound* 11.5$_2$.
*about* adv or prep 1.2$_5$; before inf 1.3$_3$; with vb 13.1$_1$; omitted 2.7$_3$.
*accept* (*of*) 13.4$_4$.
Accusative 12.1$_4$, 14.1$_1$; accusativus qualitatis, or of description 18.7$_1$.
*acknowledge* (*to*) 13.6$_4$.
*act* 16.8$_1$, 17.4$_3$.
Active and passive inf 11.6$_1$ and 6$_7$; activo-passive 16.8, 18.2$_9$.
*add* 16.8$_1$.
Addison on rel pronouns 4.3$_2$.
*address* 12.5$_7$.
Adjectives as antecedents 4.2$_4$, 6.4$_5$; adj or adv 17 passim (17.5$_7$).
Adjunct 11.1$_1$, instead of nexus 11.1$_2$; adjunct rel clauses IV — X.
*admit* (*of*) 13.4$_4$, (*to*) 13.6$_4$.
Adverbs obj 1.1$_1$, of prep 1.1$_2$, with adjuncts 1.1$_6$; adv or prep 8.7$_3$, 13.$_9$; adv or adj 17 passim; predicative 18.6.
*advise* 12.5$_7$, (*with*) 13.7$_2$.
*afraid* 15.8$_4$.
*after* (*that*) 2.2$_1$.
*against* 13.1$_2$.
*age, of* 18.6$_8$.
*agree* 16.9$_1$.
*ail* 11.2$_2$.
*all* with rel 4.8$_1$; *all which* 6.4$_7$; *all what* 6.7$_1$; with contact-clause 7.2$_3$; *all right* 17.8$_2$.
*allow* (*of*) 13.4$_4$.
*an* (*and*) 2.4$_6$.
Anacoluthon 5.5.
Analysis, grammatical and logical 11.9.
*and* = if 2.4$_6$; before rel 4.1$_2$; between subject and pred 17.8$_4$; + subject and pred 17.8$_5$; + pred alone 17.8$_7$.
*answer* 12.5$_7$, 14.9$_1$ and 9$_3$, 15.5; (*to*) 13.6$_3$.
Antecedent 3.1$_3$, 3.7$_6$, 4.1$_1$, 4.2; two coordinate 6.4$_3$.
*any* with rel 4.8$_2$.
*anywhere* with adjunct 1.1$_9$, with contact 7.7$_1$, *that* 8.6$_5$.
Apo-koinou 7.1$_3$, 7.5$_1$, 7.5$_3$ (7.5$_4$).
Aposiopesis 2.3$_4$, 2.6$_5$.
*appear* 17.5$_1$.
*apply* 16.2$_2$, 16.4$_8$.
Apposition: *the idea that* 2.1$_6$, 2.3$_5$; rel clauses 6.5; *fool that I was* 8.1$_7$; *Miss Brown that was* 8.2$_2$; *young as I am* 9.4$_2$ff; cognate obj 12.3$_2$; extraposition 17.1$_2$, 18.7$_5$; quasi-pred 17.3$_4$.
Appositional *of* 1.5$_3$.
*approach* (*to*) 13.6$_2$.
*approve* (*of*) 13.4$_5$.
*as* rel 9.1—5, after *such, as, so* 9.2, after *that*, etc. 9.3, *as* + *his* 9.3$_3$; *as . . . as* 9.4$_1$, 9.5$_1$, 9.5$_3$; *young as I am* 9.4$_2$ff; *as regards* 9.5$_3$; consecutive 9.2$_7$; predicative 9.5$_4$; in concatenation 10.7$_9$, 10.8$_1$; *as who should say* 3.5$_1$; *as* prep 10.4$_3$.
*ask* 12.5$_7$, 14.9, 15.5; (*for*) 13.2$_4$.
*at* 13.1$_3$.

*-ate*, vb in, 16.5$_4$, 16.6$_2$.
*attach* 16.2$_2$.
*attain* (*to*) 13.6$_2$.
*attend* (*on*) 13.5$_1$, (*to*) 13.6$_3$.
*attest* (to) 13.6$_4$.
Auxiliary vb with obj 12.7$_5$, 12.8.
*average* 17.6$_3$.

**B.**

*back* 16.2$_2$.
*banish* 14.9$_7$, 15.5.
*be* 17.0$_1$, 17.0$_2$, 17.7; passive 18.3; = 'cost' 18.7$_6$.
*bear* 14.2$_4$, (*with*) 13.7$_4$.
*because* (*that*) 2.3$_5$, clause subject 2.4$_4$.
*become* 11.2$_5$, 18.1$_2$.
*beg* 12.5$_7$, (*for*) 13.2$_4$.
*begin* 16.4$_1$, (*on*) 13.5$_2$.
*behave* 16.2$_2$, 16.2$_4$.
*believe* (*in*, *on*) 13.3$_2$.
*belong* 11.2$_7$.
*benefit* 16.6$_1$.
*beseech* 12.5$_7$.
*besides that* 2.2$_3$.
*bet* 14.3$_4$, 14.9$_4$, 15.3$_9$.
*better*, *were*, *had* 11.3$_1$.
*blush* 18.2$_7$.
*board* 16.6$_2$.
*boast* (*of*) 13.4$_1$.
*boil* 11.1$_3$, 16.4$_1$.
*born of* 15.8$_4$.
*bother* 16.2$_2$, 17.9$_9$.
*bow* 16.2$_2$.
*brighten* 16.5$_1$.
*brush* 16.8$_1$.
*bulk* 17.5$_6$.
*burn* 16.0, 16.4$_1$.
*but* rel (9.1$_1$), 9.7; + personal pron 9.7$_5$; *but that* 2.2$_2$; *but what* 9.7$_6$.
*button* 16.6$_2$.
*by* adv or prep 13.9$_3$; with converted subject 15.8$_1$, 15.8$_5$.

**C.**

*call* 12.6$_1$; *names* 14.9$_6$, 15.5; (*on*) 13.5$_1$.
*can* with obj 12.7$_7$, 12.8$_2$.
*carry* 16.1$_3$.
Carrying power of *wh*-pronouns 5.3$_1$.
Case, nom or oblique 4.6$_3$, 7.3$_2$, 7.4, 11.1$_6$, 12.1$_4$, 17.8$_5$, in pred 18.9; attraction 7.3$_2$.
*catch* (*at*) 13.1$_3$, *up* (*with*) 13.7$_6$, *one a kick* 14.9$_3$.
Causative 12.5$_1$, 16.4$_9$, 16.5$_1$, 16.7.
*certain* 11.4$_2$.
*chance* 11.3$_5$.
*change* 16.1$_3$, 16.4$_1$.
*charge*, *in c. of* 11.5$_3$.
*choke* 16.4$_8$.
*circumstance* inserted 2.1$_5$, 2.2$_9$.
*clap* 12.5$_4$.
Clauses as primaries II; of wonder 2.6; concatenated 10.8$_1$, 10.8$_5$; subject of verbless pred 17.9$_4$. See contact, content, interrogative, relative.
*close* 16.5$_4$.
Cognate obj 12.3.
Collectives, rel pron referring to, 6.3$_6$.
*colour* 16.6$_2$.
*come* with pred 17.4$_3$, 17.5$_4$, 18.2$_2$.
*commence* 16.4$_1$, 18.2$_8$, (*on*) 13.5$_2$.
*compare* 16.8$_1$.
*complain* 16.2$_2$.
Compound, isolation of first element 18.7$_7$; c. rel clause 10.7$_3$ff, 7.4$_3$.
Concatenation in interrogative clause 2.4$_{12}$, in rel clause 10.7, avoided 10.7$_8$, with *as* 10.7$_9$; temporal or conditional clause 10.8$_1$; two rel clauses 10.8$_4$.
*confess* 12.5$_3$, (*to*) 13.6$_4$.
*congratulate* (with) 13.7$_4$.
"Conjunctive" pron (Sweet) 3.8$_1$.

*consider* (*of*) 13.4$_1$.
*consult* (*with*) 13.7$_2$.
Contact-clause 4.3$_2$, ch. VII: obj 7.2, indirect obj 7.2$_5$, pred 7.4$_1$, subject-obj 7.4$_3$, subject 7.5, subjunct 7.6.
Content-clause 2.1, subject 2.1$_1$, obj 2.1$_2$, after prep 2.2, with or without *that* 2.3; concatenated with rel 10.7.
Continuative rel clause 4.3$_4$, 5.4, 10.6$_4$; place of prep 10.4$_6$.
*continue* 17.6$_2$.
Converted subject 15.8; same word obj and c. s. 13.8$_2$.
*cook* 16.8$_1$.
*cool* 16.5$_1$.
Coordinated rel clauses 5.3$_1$, antecedents 6.4$_3$.
Coordination instead of subordination 5.4$_4$.
*cope* (*with*) 13.7$_1$.
Copula 17.1$_1$, 17.7$_1$.
*corrupt* 16.5$_4$.
*cost* 12.1$_5$, 14.3$_4$, 15.1$_2$.
*counsel* 12.5$_7$.
*count* 16.6$_2$.
Countries, rel referring to names of 6.3$_7$.
*crave* (*for*, *after*) 13.2$_4$.
*cut up* 16.8$_1$, 18.2$_9$.

D.

Dative 12.1$_4$, 14.1$_1$, 14.1$_4$, 15.1$_1$; of interest (ethicus) 14.4$_2$.
*declare* 16.2$_2$.
*deep* adj or adv 17.2$_3$.
Defining rel clause 4.3$_4$.
Definite article, rel clause after 5.1$_7$; in pred 18.5$_1$.
*delight* 16.6$_2$.
Demonstrative pron, rel clause after 5.1$_1$, 5.1$_5$, 5.1$_9$.
*deny* 14.2$_2$.
*depart* (*from*) 13.3$_1$.
*depend upon it* 2.3$_{61}$.
*desire* (*of*) 13.4$_3$.
*determine* 16.9$_1$.
*die* with quasi-pred 17.2$_6$.
*digest* 16.8$_1$.
*dine* 16.7$_9$.
Direct obj 14.1; two 14.9.
Direct speech 2.3$_2$, 2.4$_{11}$, 2.4$_2$, 2.4$_8$f.
*dismiss* 14.9$_7$, 15.5, (*from*) 13.3$_1$.
*do* with imper 11.8$_{43}$; substitutive 12.7$_2$ff; with indirect obj 14.3$_2$; intr 16.1$_4$; *have* (*be*) *done with* 13.7$_7$; *do away* (*with*) 13.7$_5$.
*don* 12.5$_5$.
Double restriction 4.5.
*doubtless* 17.9$_7$.
*down*, place 10.4$_1$.
*draw* 16.2$_2$.
*dream* 11.2$_4$.
*dress* 16.2$_1$f, 16.2$_4$, *d. young* 17.3$_4$.
*drink* 12.5$_7$, 16.8$_1$.
*drown* 16.4$_6$.

E.

*easy* adj or adv 17.2$_4$, 17.2$_7$.
*eat* 12.5$_3$, 16.8$_1$.
Ellipsis 2.7$_1$, 3.1$_3$, 17.8$_9$; of rel pron 7.1.
*embrace* 16.3$_1$.
*empty* 16.2$_6$, 16.5$_1$.
*end* 16.4$_1$.
*engage* 16.2$_2$.
*enough* (*fool e.*) 18.4$_4$.
*enter* 12.5$_1$; (*into*) 13.3$_3$, (*on*) 13.5$_2$.
*entreat* (*of*) 13.4$_3$.
*entrust* 12.5$_5$.
*envy* 12.5$_7$, 14.9$_1$, 14.9$_3$, 15.5.
*escape* (*from*) 13.3$_1$.
Euphony in choice of rel 4.3$_5$.
*evacuate* 12.5$_6$.
*every*, rel clause after 4.8$_2$; *e. now and then* 1.1$_6$; *everywhere she went* 7.7$_1$, *everywhere that* 8.6$_5$.
*exactly* inserted 3.8$_7$.

*examine* (*into*) 13.3$_3$.
*except that* 2.2$_2$.
Exclamations 8.1$_8$f, 9.4$_1$; pred alone 17.8$_6$, pred with rel clause 4.7, 17.8$_8$ff.
*excuse* 12.5$_7$, 14.9$_3$.
Exhausted rel 5.5.
*expel* (*from*) 13.3$_1$.
Extraposition 2.1$_3$, 3.7$_5$, 17.1$_1$, 17.1$_2$; mental parentheses 5.7.

F.

*fact* inserted 2.1$_5$, 2.2$_9$.
*fail* (*of*) 13.4$_2$.
*fair* (*speak, bid, play*) 17.3$_1$ff.
*fall* 16.4$_9$, 18.2$_4$.
*familiar* 11.5$_3$.
*familiarize* 12.5$_5$.
*fast* adj or adv 17.2$_4$.
*fear* 16.6$_2$, (*for*) 13.2$_6$.
*feed* 12.5$_5$, 14.2$_1$, 16.2$_2$, 16.6$_2$.
*feel* 16.2$_2$f, 17.5$_2$.
*few*, rel after, 4.8$_4$ (4.4$_1$).
*fight* 12.3$_1$, 12.5$_3$, (*against*) 13.1$_2$, (*with*) 13.7$_1$, *shy* 17.6$_3$.
*filch* 12.5$_6$.
*fill* 16.5$_1$, 5$_2$.
*fine* vb 14.3$_4$.
*finish* (*with*) 13.7$_7$.
*fit* vb 16.5$_1$.
*fix* vb 12.6$_1$.
*flee* (*from*) 13.3$_1$.
*fly* 16.4$_9$.
*for* 13.2; omitted 2.7$_3$; *for that* 2.2$_5$.
*forgive* 14.9$_1$, 14.9$_3$, 15.5.
*form* vb 16.8$_1$.
*frightened of* 15.8$_4$.
*from* 13.3$_1$; *here, hence*, etc 1.1$_1$; *out* (*of*), *forth, off* 1.2$_8$.
*furnish* 12.5$_5$.
*-fy* 16.5$_4$.

G.

Gender of rel and interrogative pron, 6.2$_1$, 6.3.
Generic use of *he that*, etc 5.1$_1$ff.
Genitives as primaries 1.4, 1.5; *St. Paul's, at a butcher's* 1.4$_5$ff.; *a friend of Tom's* 1.5; antecedent 4.2$_2$f., rel clause after gen 5.1$_9$; predicative 18.5$_5$.
*get*, meaning of 18.1$_3$, 18.7$_4$, 18.9; with pred 16.2$_8$, 18.1$_3$; (*at*) 13.1$_3$; *over* 13.9$_{15}$.
*give* 14.2$_1$, intr 16.1$_4$, *to understand* 15.3$_1$, *over* 13.9$_{11}$.
*go* with (quasi-)pred 17.2$_2$f., 17.4$_1$, 18.2$_1$.
*God* omitted 11.8$_6$.
*graze* 12.5$_3$.
*grow* 16.7$_9$, 18.1$_2$.
*guess* (*at*) 13.1$_3$.

H.

*hang* 12.5$_4$, 16.7$_8$, with pred 17.4$_2$.
Haplology 2.5$_4$.
*happen* 11.3$_4$.
*have* with obj (substitutive) 12.7$_8$; with contact-clause 7.5$_3$; *have it that* 2.1$_3$; *had better, rather* 11.3$_1$.
*he that* 5.1$_1$, 5.1$_6$; *he who* 5.1$_2$, 5.1$_6$.
*heal* 16.5$_1$.
*hear* with two obj 14.9$_1$, 14.9$_3$, 15.5.
*help* 12.5$_5$.
*here is* (*are*) with contact-clause 7.5$_7$; *here you are, here goes* 11.8$_2$.
*hide* 16.2$_2$.
*hold* 13.4$_7$, 16.4$_8$, with pred 17.6$_2$.
*hope* (*for*) 13.2$_2$.
*hwa* 3.6$_2$, 6.1, *hwam* of things 6.1.
Hypotaxis 2.3$_2$, 2.4$_1$, 5.4$_4$.

I.

I, rel after 4.6$_3$, 5.2$_1$.
*if* 2.4$_6$, 2.4$_8$.
*ill* 18.6$_4$.
Imperative without subject 11.8$_3$, with subject 11.8$_4$; with or without reflexive 16.4$_2$, 16.7$_2$.

Impersonal 11.8$_1$, becomes personal 11.2, 11.9$_1$.
*impress* 12.5$_7$.
*improve* (*on*) 13.5$_2$.
*in* 13.3$_2$; *in case* 2.3$_5$; *in here* 1.1$_2$; *in that* 2.2$_4$.
Inarticulate sentence 7.1$_4$, 7.5, 8.7$_3$, 9.1$_1$; with *but* 9.7$_3$.
Inchoative 16.7.
Indefinite article in pred 18.4$_2$ff., in clause of wonder 2.6$_3$.
Indefinite rel pron 3.1$_2$, 3.6; in preposed pred 17.9$_{52}$.
Indirect object 14.1ff.; emotional 14.4$_2$; a thing 14.5$_2$; place 14.7$_1$; after *do* 12.7$_4$; interrogative or rel pron 14.8$_3$; omitted in contact-clause 7.2$_5$.
Indirect questions 2.4f.; word-order 18.5$_3$.
Indirect speech 2.3$_2$, 2.4$_{11}$, 2.4$_2$.
*indulge* 16.2$_2$, (*in*) 13.3$_2$.
Ing of prepositional phrase 13.9$_7$; active or passive 16.8$_6$; cf also 11.6$_9$, 17.9$_{32}$.
Infinitive as primary 1.3; obj 1.3$_1$, 14.6$_1$; with *to* 1.3$_2$f.; subject of verbless pred 17.3$_1$; combinations in rel clauses 10.1$_2$f, 10.5$_5$; *is easy to find* 11.6$_1$ff., *to be found* 11.6$_7$f.; *a better thing to find* 11.6$_4$.
*inherit* 12.5$_3$.
*inspire* 12.5$_7$.
*instead of that* 2.2$_3$.
Instrumental obj 12.4; or obj of result 12.4$_4$.
Interrogative clause 2.4; subject 2.4$_3$f., obj 2.4$_5$, after prep 2.5; i. pron, differentiated 6.1ff., 6.8; i. or rel 3.8; rel clause after i. pron 4.8$_5$; i. pron or adv in preposed pred 17.9$_{51}$.
*into*, *in to* 1.2$_9$; with verb 13.3$_3$.
Intransitive 12.1$_2$; by omission of obj 16.1, by omission of reflexive 16.2, of reflexive 16.3; verbs like *move*, *change* 16.4, verbs from adj 16.5, from subst 16.6; form in Somerset 16.1$_9$.
*investigate* (*into*) 13.3$_3$.
*is* and *has* confounded 18.7$_4$.
*issue* 12.5$_5$.
*it* represents clause 2.1$_3$, 2.3$_{61}$f., 2.4$_3$; before clause 2.1$_3$, 2.2$_7$, 3.7$_6$; indirect obj 14.5$_1$f., place 14.7$_4$; omitted 11.8$_{63}$, 16.1$_5$. — *it am* (*is*) *I* 4.6$_3$, 7.5$_3$, *it is me* 18.9; *it is* before rel clause 2.3$_7$, 4.6; person of vb in clause 4.6$_3$; two rel clauses 4.6$_6$f., before contact-clause 7.2$_2$, 7.5$_3$; *it is that that* 8.3$_2$.

J.

*jar* (*on*) 13.5$_2$.
*join* 12.6$_2$, (*with*) 13.7$_3$.
Junction 11.1$_1$, instead of nexus 11.1$_2$.
*just* inserted 3.8$_7$.

K.

*keep* 16.1$_3$, 16.2$_2$, 16.2$_5$, with pred 17.6$_2$.
*kiss* (*each other*) 16.3$_1$; *good night* 14.9$_6$, 15.5.
*knock up* 16.4$_6$.
*know* (*about*) 13.1$_1$, (*of*) 13.4$_1$; *known to* 15.8$_7$.

L.

*lack* 16.9$_3$, (*for*) 13.2.$_3$.
*last* vb 12.1$_5$, 15.1$_2$.
*laugh one's thanks* 12.2$_4$.
*lay* 12.6$_2$, 16.7$_1$, 16.7$_3$f.
*lead* 14.9$_5$.
*learn* 16.7$_9$.
*leave go* (*of*) 13.4$_8$.
*lecture* (*to*) 13.6$_3$.
*let* 16.8$_1$, *let go* (*of*) 13.4$_8$, *let down* 16.4$_5$.

*lie* 16.7$_1$, 16.7$_3$f.
*lift* 16.2$_2$.
*like* vb 11.2$_1$, (*of*) 13.4$_5$.
*like* adv 10.4$_1$.
*likely* 11.4$_5$.
Limited number (*which*) 6.2$_1$, 6.8$_2$f., 3.5$_6$, 3.6$_7$.
Link-verb 17.1$_1$, 17.7$_1$.
*list* vb 11.2$_1$.
*listen* (*to*) 13.6$_1$.
*little*, rel clause after, 4.8$_4$.
*live* with quasi-pred 17.2$_6$.
*lock* 16.4$_5$.
*lodge* 16.6$_2$.
*long* adv 1.1$_7$; *we are long before* 11.4$_5$.
*look* 12.6$_4$, 17.5$_5$, 17.5$_7$.
*loom* 17.5$_6$.
Loose rel clause 4.3$_4$, 4.4.
*loose* pred 18.2$_6$.
*love*, *in* and *out of*, 18.6$_8$.
*low* adj or adv 17.2$_7$.

## M.

*make* with pred 16.2$_7$, 17.6$_1$; *m. a fool of* 13.4$_7$.
*marry* 12.5$_2$, 16.1$_6$, 16.3$_1$; (*with*) 13.7$_4$; *m. young* 17.3$_4$.
Mass-words pred 18.4$_3$, (18.4$_4$).
*matter* sb 17.9$_3$, 18.5$_3$; vb. 11.2$_6$.
*may* with obj 12.7$_7$.
*meet* 16.3$_1$, (*with*) 13.7$_3$.
*mend* 16.2$_2$.
Mental parenthesis 5.7, (9.5$_1$).
*mind* (*about*) 13.1$_1$.
*miss* 16.9$_4$, (*of*) 13.4$_2$.
*mistake* 16.1$_8$.
*much*, rel clause after, 4.8$_4$.

## N.

*near* 10.4$_1$.
*need* 16.9$_5$, (*of*) 13.4$_5$, (*with*) 13.7$_4$.
Nexus 11.1$_1$; adjunct instead of n. 11.1$_2$; n. of deprecation 17.8$_3$.
Nexus-object 11.6$_3$, 14.1$_3$, 18.6$_9$, 18.8$_8$.
Nexus-questions 2.4$_{11}$, 2.4$_6$.
Nexus-subjuncts 17.8$_5$.
Nexus-substantive, with *which* 6.5$_4$.
*no*, rel after 4.8$_3$; *no matter* 17.9$_8$; *no news is good news* 11.1$_2$.
Nominative or oblique case 7.4, 4.6$_3$, 7.5$_3$.
Non-restrictive rel clause 4.3$_4$, 4.4, 5.1$_8$, 8.1$_2$, 8.2$_1$.
*notwithstanding that* 2.2$_2$.
Noun-clauses 2.1.
*now that* 8.6$_3$f.
*nowhere* (*to go*) 1.1$_8$, with adjunct 1.1$_9$, with clause 7.7$_1$.
Numeral pred 18.5$_6$.

## O.

Object 11.1$_7$, definition 12.1; of result 12.2; cognate 12.3, 15.1$_4$; instrumental 12.4; retained 15.2$_1$; direct and indirect 14.1ff.; two direct objects 14.9; formerly o., now subject 11.2, object-subject 11.7$_1$; same word o. and subject 10.8$_3$, 11.7$_2$, 13.8$_2$; of vb and prep 7.2$_6$, 8.5$_2$, 10.2$_6$, 13.8$_1$, 13.9 (cf 10.2$_6$); left out in contact-clause 7.2; o. without verb 12.7$_1$; with phrases 12.8$_5$; or subjunct 12.1$_5$; relation to predicative 18.9; infin obj 1.3$_3$ff.; cf also Nexus-object.
Oblique, see Case.
*obtain* 16.4$_8$.
*of* partitive or appositional 1.5$_1$ff., *friend of Tom's* 1.5$_1$; *the three of us*, *City of Rome*, *name of Trotwood* 1.5$_3$; *of three years old*, *a devil of a life* 1.5$_4$; with verbs 13.4; with converted subject 15.8$_2$; after ing of phrase 13.9$_7$; place 10.3$_1$ff.; omitted 2.7$_2$.

*offend* (against) 13.1$_2$.
*offer* 16.2$_2$.
Omission, see Ellipsis.
*on* 13.5; omitted 2.7$_3$.
*once that* 8.6$_4$.
*onto*, *on to* 1.2$_9$.
*open* 16.5$_3$, pred 18.2$_6$.
*operate* (*on*) 13.5$_2$.
*oppose* 12.5$_7$.
*over* 13.5$_5$; adv or prp 13.9$_{11}$ff.
*overeat* (*-sleep*, *-work*) 16.2$_6$.
*owe* 14.3$_1$, 14.8$_8$; passive 15.1$_2$, 15.3$_6$; *owe it that* 2.1$_3$.
*own* (*to*) 13.6$_4$.

P.

*paint a different colour* 14.9$_8$, 15.5, 18.7$_2$, 18.7$_9$.
Parataxis 2.3$_2$, 2.4$_1$, 5.4$_4$ (5.6$_7$), 7.8.
*pardon* 14.9$_3$.
Parentheses 5.7.
*part* 12.6$_5$.
*partake of* 13.4$_2$.
Participle in rel clause 10.1$_4$.
*pass* 12.5$_1$, 16.4$_1$, *by* 13.9$_3$.
Passive ch. XV; verbs not used in p. 15.1$_2$f.; of being and becoming 18.3; passive meaning of active 16, especially 16.8, 16.9.
*pay* 12.5$_5$, intr 16.1$_3$.
*penetrate* (*into*) 13.3$_3$.
*permit* (*of*) 13.4$_4$.
Person, name of, substituted for thing 11.5$_1$.
Personal pronoun, rel clause after 5.1; supplements rel 5.6. Cf. Impersonal.
*photograph* 16.8$_1$.
*plant* 12.5$_4$.
*play* 12.6$_3$, 17.4$_3$; with pred 17.4$_3$; (*at*) 13.1$_3$, (*for*) 13.2$_5$, (*on*) 13.5$_2$.
*plead guilty* 17.6$_3$.
*please* 11.2$_1$, 15.1$_1$; without subject 11.8$_1$.
*ponder* (*over*, *on*) 13.5$_1$.
*poorly* 18.6$_4$.
*possess* 12.5$_3$.
Possessive pron pred 18.5$_5$; rel after 4.2$_3$, 5.1$_7$.
*precisely* inserted 3.8$_7$.
Predicative ch. XVII and XVIII; of being 17.0$_1$, 17.4ff., of becoming 18.1ff., 18.6$_7$; neuter 6.4$_4$, 6.8$_2$, 6.8$_4$, 8.1$_6$; what can be 18.4; comparison with subject 18.4$_1$, 18.5, with object 18.9; without verb 17.8, without verb and subject 17.8$_6$f.
Preparatory *it* 3.7$_6$.
*prepare* 16.2$_2$, 16.2$_5$; (*for*) 13.2$_7$.
Preposition with verbs ch. XIII (13.9); p. or adverb 8.7$_3$, 13.9; after other prep 1.2$_3$ff., before *that* (conj.) 2.2, before interrogative clause 2.5, before rel clause 3.7$_4$; place 2.2$_6$, 2.5$_5$, 7.2$_6$, 8.5$_1$, 9.2$_2$, 9.6$_1$, 9.7$_2$, 10.2f., 10.3$_5$, 10.4, 13.9$_5$; prep both in beginning and end 10.5$_1$, 10.6$_3$; one instead of two 2.5$_4$, 3.2, 10.5$_2$; no p. before clause 2.7; left out with subjunct-predicative 18.7$_2$f.; p. with object pred 18.6.
Prepositional verbal phrases XIII; passive 15.6.
*present* 12.5$_5$.
*pretend* (*to*) 13.6$_4$.
*prevail* (*on*) 13.5$_3$.
Primaries, various ch I; adv 1.1, prep + obj 1.2; inf 1.3; gen 1.4f.; clauses ch. II and III; governed by secondary or tertiary words 16.9$_6$; cf Antecedent.
*profit* 16.6$_1$.
Pronoun, see case, interrogative, reciprocal, reflexive, relative. Place of direct and indirect obj 14.7.

Prosiopesis $11.8_6$, $11.8_7$.
*prove* $16.2_2$, $16.2_5$.
*provide* $12.5_5$, (*for*) $13.2_7$.
Pull-up sentences $2.3_4$.
*put in mind* (*of*) $13.4_1$; *put up* $16.1_3$, (*with*) $13.7_5$.
*puzzle* $16.2_2$.

Q.

*qualify* $16.2_6$.
Quasi-predicatives $17.1_1$, 17.2, 17.3, combined with real pred $17.3_6$; transition to real pred $17.4_1$ff.; of becoming $18.1_1$.
Questions, two kinds $2.4_{11}$; indirect 2.4ff.
*question* $12.5_7$.
*quick(ly)* $17.2_4$.
Quotation, direct and indirect $2.3_2$, $2.4_1$, $2.4_2$.

R.

*rain* $12.4_4$.
*rarely* $18.6_5$.
*rather* (had r., etc) $2.3_{32}$, $11.3_1$.
*read* $16.8_1$.
Reciprocal pron omitted 16.3.
*recover* $16.1_3$, $16.2_2$, $16.2_5$.
Reflexive pron omitted 16.2; r. verbs passive $15.1_3$.
*refrain* (*from*) $13.3_1$.
*regular* adj or adv $17.2_5$.
*relation* $18.8_5$.
Relative adverbs $5.4_3$, 10.6; in clause primaries $3.7_2$; + personal pron 5.6.
Relative clauses as primaries ch. III, as adjuncts ch. IV — IX; concatenated with content-clause 10.7, with temporal or conditional clause $10.8_1$, with second rel clause $10.8_4$; r. or interrogative 3.8, instead of interrogative $3.8_8$. Cf *as*, *but*, Contact-clause, *that*.
Relative pronouns, see *what*, *which*, *who*.
*remark* (*on*) $13.\ 5_1$.
*remember* $12.5_3$, (*of*) $13.4_1$.
*repent* $16.2_2$, (*of*) $13.4_1$, $11.2_3$.
*represent* $12.6_3$.
Representative *it* $2.1_3$, $2.3_{61}$, $2.4_3$, $3.7_6$.
*require* $16.9_5$.
*resemble*, passive $15.1_2$.
*resolve* $16.9_1$, (*on*) $13.5_3$.
*rest* $16.2_2$, with pred $17.6_2$, *r. his soul* $11.8_{62}$.
Restrictive rel clause $4.3_4$, 4.4, $8.3_2$; after *it is* 4.6; double restriction 4.5.
Result, obj of, 12.2.
Resumption of rel clause primary $3.7_5$.
Retained obj $15.2_1$; form $15.4_1$.
*retire* $16.2_2$.
Rhythm $7.5_9$, $14.7_4$, $14.7_6$.
*ring* $16.7_9$, with pred $17.5_2$.
*ripen* $16.5_1$.
*rob* $12.5_6$.
*roll* $16.4_1$.
*rouse* $16.2_2$.
*rub* $16.8_1$.
*rue* $11.2_3$.
*run* $12.5_1$, $18.2_3$; *with* $11.5_2$; *parallel* $17.4_1$.

S.

*safe* (*he is s. to*) $11.4_3$.
*sail* $12.5_1$.
*same* rel clause after $4.9_2$, 7 passim, $9.1_2$.
*search* (*for*) $13.2_4$.
*see* (*to*) $13.6_2$ ($2.2_7$, $2.7_3$).
*seek* (*for*) $13.2_4$.
*seem* $17.5_1$; *I seem* = *me seems* $11.3_3$.
*seldom* pred $18.6_5$.
*sell* $16.8_1$.
Semi-articulate sentences and clauses $2.4_{511}$, 11.8, 17.8, 17.9.

Sentences without subject 11.8.
*serve* $12.5_5$.
*set* $16.7_1$, $16.7_3$, $16.7_5$.
*settle* $16.2_2$, $16.2_4$.
*shall* with obj $12.7_6$.
*sham* with pred $17.6_3$.
*share* (*in*) $13.3_2$.
*shave* $16.2_2$.
*she that*, etc, see *he*.
*shine* $17.5_4$.
*show* $16.2_2$.
*shut* vb $16.4_5$; pred $18.2_6$.
*sight*, *in s. of* $11.5_3$.
*sing* $12.5_4$.
*sink* 16.0, $16.7_8$.
*sit* $16.7_1$, $16.7_2$, $16.7_5$; no passive $15.1_2$.
*sleep* $16.7_9$, *sound(ly)* $17.2_7$.
*slow* adj or adv $17.2_4$.
*smell* $12.5_3$, $17.5_2$; (*to*) $13.6_2$.
*smoke* $16.8_1$.
*sound* vb $17.5_2$.
*sound(ly)* $17.2_7$.
*sow* $12.5_4$.
*speak* $12.6_7$, with quasi-pred $17.3_1$.
*speed* $16.7_9$.
*spring* $12.5_1$, $16.4_9$.
*spy* (*on*) $13.5_3$.
*stamp* $13.7_4$.
*stand* $16.7_6$, $17.4_2$, (*for*) $13.2_7$.
*starve* $16.7_9$.
Statistics of rel clauses $4.3_5$.
*stay* $12.6_6$, $16.7_7$.
*steal* $16.2_2$.
*stick* $16.7_9$, (*to*) $13.6_5$.
*still* adj or adv $17.2_7$.
*stir* $16.2_5$, $16.4_1$.
*stop* $16.4_1$.
*stream with* $11.5_2$.
*strengthen* $16.6_2$.
*strike* $14.9_1$, $14.9_3$, 15.5, $16.8_1$; with pred $17.5_3$.
*strip* $12.5_6$, 16.2.
Subaudition, see Ellipsis.
Subject ch. XI, XV; definition $11.1_5$, signs $11.1_6$; shifting from obj 11.2; s. not correctly indicated $11.5_1$; analysis 11.9; s. or predicative 18.5; of passive, direct and indirect obj 15.2, of vb with two direct objects 15.5; prepositional phrases 15.6f.; converted subject 15.8; no subject $7.1_4$, 7.5, $8.7_3$, $9.1_1$, 11.8; subject-object $7.4_3$, $10.7_2$, $10.7_3$.
Subjunct or obj $12.1_5$.
Subjunct-predicative 18.7, 18.8.
*subscribe* $16.2_2$.
*subsist* $16.7_9$.
Substantive-clause 2.1.
Substitutive verbs with obj 12.7.
*such as* 9.2, *who*, *whose* $9.2_4$.
*suffer* $14.9_3$.
Superlatives, obj $12.2_5$; rel clause $4.9_1$.
*supply* $12.5_5$.
*sure*, *he is sure to* $11.4_1$.
*swarm* $11.5_2$.
*sweat* $16.7_9$.

## T.

*take* two obj $14.9_1$, $14.9_3$, 15.5; pred $18.2_5$; *take it that* $2.1_3$.
*talk* $12.6_7$, $17.3_1$.
*taste* pred $17.5_2$; (*of*) $13.4_2$.
*teach* $14.9_6$, $15.3_9$.
*tear* $16.8_1$.
*tell* $14.3_3$, $14.6_3$, $16.8_1$.
*than* 9.1, 9.6; *than what* $9.6_2$; *than whom*, *which* $10.4_2$.
*that* demonstrative pron, before poss $1.5_6$, before content-clause $2.2_8$, before rel clause $7.3_3$ff., 8.3; *that which* in mental parenthesis $5.7_3$; *that is* $7.5_5$; obj after auxiliary verb $12.8_4$. — Doubtful whether dem or rel $3.7_1$, $7.1_6$, $7.3_3$.
*that* conjunction (or relative connective) $2.3_1$, after prep, etc,

2.2, clauses with or without *that* 2.3; rel 4.3, 4.6, ch. VIII; non-restrictive $8.1_2$; refers to person $8.1_3$ff., predicative $8.1_6$f., *that was* (etc) $8.2_1$f.; prep at end $8.5_1$; subjunct $8.6_1$; *now that* $8.6_3$; avoided after demonstrative *that* 8.3; approaches clause of consequence $8.4_1$; *that I know* $8.4_2$; redundant $8.7_4$; *that . . . they* (*his*, etc) $5.6_3$. — Is *that* a pronoun? 8.7.

*the*, see Definite article; with comparative $17.9_6$.

*there is* with contact-clause following $7.5_6$; in contact-clause $7.5_9$; *there is* + subst + pred $17.7_2$.

*they that* $5.1_3$; *they who* (*which*) $5.1_4$, $5.1_6$.

*think* (*I think*, *me thinks*) $11.3_2$, $11.8_1$; obj $12.6_7$; (*for*) $13.2_5$.

*this* with poss $1.5_6$; inserted before clause $2.2_8$; rel clause after $5.1_9$.

*those* before rel clause $5.1_5$.

*thou* with rel clause $5.2_3$; omitted $11.8_5$.

*threaten* $12.5_7$.

*through* adv or prep $13.9_2$; *through with* $13.7_7$.

*tip* (*with*) $13.7_4$.

*tire* $16.4_3$.

*to* with verb 13.6; for indirect obj $14.6_3$, 14.8, passive $15.2_2$; *do to* $12.7_4$; omitted $2.2_7$, $2.7_3$; with infin $1.3_2$ff.; *to be* inserted before pred $17.0_2$.

*to-day*, *to-morrow* primary $1.2_1$.

*together* $16.3_2$.

*too many cooks* $11.1_2$.

*toss* $16.4_1$.

*touch* $16.3_1$, (*on*) $13.5_1$.

Transitive $12.1_2$, ch. XVI.

*treat* (*of*) $13.4_1$.

*trouble* $16.2_3$.

*true* before sentence $17.9_7$.

*trust* $12.5_5$.

*turn* $12.6_5$, $16.2_2$, $16.4_1$; with pred $18.2_5$; (*of*) $13.4_6$.

*twice* obj $1.1_7$.

*tyrannize* $13.5_5$.

U.

*understand* $14.9_4$; *understanded of* $15.8_3$; "understood", see Ellipsis.

*up*, place $10.4_1$.

*upon* 13,5.

*use* (*no u.*) $18.7_3$, $18.8_6$.

V.

*value* $11.5_4$.

Verb, transitive and intr $12.1_2$, ch. XVI; with various objects $12.2_2$, 12.5f.; with obj and prep ch. XIII; with (quasi-) predicatives XVII, XVIII; from adj 16.5; from subst 16.6. — Sentences or clauses without verbs 17.8, 17.9. — Verbs which do not take content-clause $2.1_4$.

Verbal idea as antecedent $4.2_4$, $6.4_6$ ($6.5_2$, $6.5_4$).

*visit* (*at*, *with*) $13.1_3$.

W.

*wait* $12.6_6$.

*walk* $12.1_5$, $12.5_1$.

*want* $16.9_2$, (*for*) $13.2_3$.

*warm* $16.5_1$.

*wash* $16.2_1$ff., $16.8_1$.

*watch* (*over*) $13.5_5$.

*wax* $18.1_2$.

*way* (*grope one's way*) $12.2_3$.

*we*, rel clause after $5.2_2$.

*wear* $16.8_2$, $18.2_9$.

*weary* $16.5_1$.

*weigh* $12.1_5$, $12.5_1$, $15.1_2$, $17.6_3$.

*well* (*wish him well*) $14.3_1$; pred $18.6_4$.

*wh-* pronouns, differentiation ch. VI; carrying power $5.3_1$; place ch. X.
*what* interrogative $6.8_1$, $6.8_4$; *what price* $17.9_5$.
*what* rel $3.4$; pl $3.4_2$; adjunct $3.4_6$; in clause adjuncts 6.7; in mental parenthesis $5.7_2$, $5.7_4$; redundant $9.6_2$; *but what* $3.4_3$f., $9.7_6$; *what . . . and what, and which* $3.4_7$.
*whatever* $3.6_5$, $5.7_7$; *whatso* $3.6_2$; *whatsoever* $3.6_3$, *whatsomever* $3.6_4$.
*where is* with contact-clause $7.5_7$.
*whereby, wherein*, etc 10.6.
*whether* rel $3.5_7$; conjunction $2.4_4$, $2.4_7$.
*which* interrogative $6.8_2$.
*which* rel, in clause primaries $3.5_1$, $3.5_6$; in clause adjuncts 4.3 — 4.6; persons $6.3_2$f., $6.4_4$; animals $6.3_5$; collectives $6.3_6$; countries $6.3_7$; neuter pred $6.4_4$f.; verbal idea $6.4_7$; whole sentence $6.4_7$; *of which* $6.6_2$; *which* + *he* (*his*) $5.6_5$; *which* adjunct 6.5, *which latter* $6.5_1$, with nexus-word $6.5_4$. — Place ch. X. — *Which* used for conjunction *that* $8.6_6$.
*whichever, whichso, whichsoever* $3.6_7$, $5.7_7$.
*who* interrogative $6.8_2$; *who who* avoided $4.8_5$.
*who* rel, in clause primaries 3.5 (*as who should* say $3.5_1$, *whom he chooses* $3.5_3$, *forbid who will* $3.5_5$); in clause adjuncts, 4.3 — 4.6, ch. V; persons $6.3_2$f., animals $6.3_5$, collectives $6.3_6$, countries $6.3_7$, things $6.3_8$; avoids ambiguity $6.4_1$; *who* + *his*, etc $5.6_6$; *who* after *such* $9.2_4$f. — Place ch. X.
*who* or *whom* (*whomever*, etc) 3.3, $10.7_3$ff.
*whoever, whoso, whoso(m)ever* $3.6_1$ff.; genitive $3.6_6$.
Whole thought, rel refers to 5.7, $6.4_7$.
*whose* $3.3_6$, $3.5_4$; neuter rel 6.6, interrogative $6.8_1$; place $10.1_5$, $10.5_6$.
*will* obj $12.7_5$, $12.8_3$f.
*wish* $14.3_1$, (*for*) $13.2_1$.
*with* $12.3_3$, 13.7; converted subject $15.8_6$; place $10.3_4$.
*withal* $8.7_3$.
*withdraw* $16.2_2$, $16.2_5$.
*without* in rel clause (verbal phrase) $10.2_3$; *without that* $2.2_3$.
*witness* sb or vb $17.9_9$; (*to*) $13.6_4$.
*woe* $11.3_1$.
Word-order in rel clause ch. X; place of subject and obj $11.1_6$; of two obj 14.7; in prepositional phrases 13.9; in indirect questions $18.5_3$. Cf. Prepositions.
*work* $16.7_9$.
*wrap* $12.5_5$.

X.

x-questions $2.4_{11}$, $2.4_3$, $2.4_5$.

Y.

*you*, rel. clause after $5.2_3$; with imperative $11.8_4$.
*young* $17.3_4$.

GETTY CENTER LIBRARY
3 3125 00074 4561